DUE DATE SLIP

GOVT COLLEGE, LIBRARY

KOTA (Raj)

Students can retain library books only for two weeks at the most

BORROWER S No	DUE DTATE	SIGNATURE

A CRITICAL STUDY OF
DANDIN AND HIS WORKS

A CRITICAL STUDY OF
DAṆḌIN
AND HIS WORKS

DHARMENDRA KUMAR GUPTA
M A M O L Ph D

MEHARCHAND LACHHMANDAS
DELHI 6

Published by MEHARCHAND LACHHMANDAS
Oriental & Foreign Booksellers *Props* Sanskrit Book Depot
2736 Kucha Chelan Daryaganj DELHI-6 (India)

© First Edition - 1970

Rs. PRICE 60/-
DELHI

Printed at Bharat Bharati Press 1 Ansari Road Daryaganj DELHI 6
Composed by Rajendra Tiwari at Harishchandra Composing Agency

कविर्दण्डी कविर्दण्डी कविर्दण्डी न संशय ।

—Anonymous

• • •

आचार्यदण्डिनो वाचामाचान्तामृतसम्पदाम् ।
विकासो वेधस पत्न्या विलासमणिदर्पणम् ॥

—Gangadevi

• • •

जाते जगति वाल्मीकौ कविरित्यभिधाऽभवत् ।
कवी इति ततो व्यासे कवयस्त्वयि दण्डिनि ॥

—From *Subhāṣitahārāvali*

• • •

उत्पादयति सर्वस्य प्रीतिं दण्डि गिरां रस ।
'ननु दाक्षिण्यसम्पन्न सर्वस्य भवति प्रिय ॥'
अवन्तिसुन्दरीं दश - कुमारचरित तथा ।
द्विसंधान च काव्य य काव्यादर्श च निर्ममे ॥
स आचार्य कविर्दण्डी दाक्षिणात्यो जयत्यहो ।
मानसे रमते यस्य सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती ॥

—The present writer

PREFACE

The Sanskrit literature occupies a prominent place in the classical literatures of the world by virtue of its great antiquity, amazing magnitude, vast expansion, luxuriant development of various literary forms, and a comprehensive range which it amply commands The fact that it richly reflects our ancient culture and civilisation in their manifold aspects, and enables us to have a glimpse into our past also enhances its value for us, while its intrinsic qualities of literary charm and artistic beauty and stylistic finish are undoubtedly unique This great literature climbs the apex of its glory in the Gupta period (from the 4th century to the middle of the 6th century A D), the Golden Age of Indian History, and in the following centuries which visualised, besides the great religious and cultural revival, an august literary renaissance in the works of Kālidāsa and Bhāravi in the field of poetry, of Viśākhadatta, Harṣa and Bhavabhūti together with those of Kālidāsa in the sphere of drama and of Subandhu, Bāna and Daṇḍin in the arena of prose *kāvya*, in addition to those of Suśruta, Āryabhaṭa and Varāhamihira in the field of scientific literature Among these bright luminaries of Classical Sanskrit literature, Daṇḍin occupies an important place both as a writer of prose romances and as a poetician

Despite the important position the writer holds in Sanskrit literature no attempt worth the name has so far been made to study in detail his life and works in all their aspects Of course some efforts have been made, through research journals and general books on history of Classical Sanskrit literature, to solve some of the problems relating to his writings or his period or to the geographical or historical data of the *Daśakumāra carita*, but while we are far from satisfactory or generally acceptable solutions of the outstanding problems in these sporadic studies, no literary or cultural study of his work or works has

been attempted so far [1] And consequently, while on one hand the problems of the identity of the authors of the works traditionally ascribed to him his authorship of the books hypothetically attributed to him and the age to which he belonged are still open questions on the other the literary and cultural value of his works remains almost unassessed In the field of prose *kāvya* his achievements are unjustifiably underestimated in comparison with Subandhu and Bāna who though more successful than Daṇḍin in representing the literary aspirations of the contemporary age fall below him in presenting life in all its varied aspects of general application, and making thereby a universal appeal In the sphere of Poetics, his contributions are not fully recognised simply because he is an early writer in whom the poetical theories allegedly appear in their primitive form No doubt the chief doctrines of Sanskrit Poetics were established with greater scientific acumen and detail in the later period, but we cannot possibly deny the historical importance which the theories appearing in rudimentary form in the comparatively early writers possess inasmuch as they throw light on many of the concepts of Poetics in the making on the background of which we are able to trace their development in the subsequent writers It may also be said that many of the poetical theories particularly the views on the difference between *katha* and *akhyāyika* the *mārgas* and their constituent *guṇas* and the conception of individual poetic figures which appear in Daṇḍin sustain their doctrinal value even in the later period of consummate rhetorical studies Equally important is the cultural study of the writer's works which like Bāṇa's writings present a pervasive view of the culture and civilisation of India of that age

1 M Collins *Geographical Data of the Raghuvamśa and Daśakumāracarita* (1907) and Gawronski's *Sprachl Untersuchungen uber das Mrcchakatika und das Daśakumāracarita* (1907) deal partially with one of Daṇḍin's works and they do so with very much restricted scope Jaya Shankar Tripathi's *Ācārya Daṇḍī evam Sanskrit Kāvyaśāstra kā Itihāsadarśana* (1968) is a recent attempt to study the writer as a poetician The main findings of the book have been taken note of in the present work

The present work which is a part of my thesis approved for the Degree of Ph D by the Panjab University, Chandigarh, attempts a study of the literary aspect of the works of the writer, giving a critical assessment of his contribution to the study of Poetics and to the Classical Sanskrit prose The study dealing with the social and cultural aspect of the works of the writer has been envisaged for a separate work under the title *Society and Culture in the Time of Dandin*, to follow the present volume

The work is divided into three parts, each containing a number of chapters on different aspects of the subject in hand

The first part deals, in four chapters, with the basic problems relating to the writer's identity, his works and the period in which he flourished, and his life, and attempts to give their probable solutions Of course, it cannot profess in view of the paucity of evidences, to give a final reply to the vexed questions, but it does claim to throw a new light on many of the important aspects of the much debated problems The prevalent theory that there were more than one writer bearing the name Daṇḍin, to which the scholars of the eminence of A B Keith and S K De gave their direct or indirect support has been refuted with ample evidence for the first time in definite terms By adducing a number of unmistakable points of affinity with regard to the content language and diction in the works traditionally ascribed to Daṇḍin and by accounting for the divergence occasionally noticed in the works the present writer has tried to establish on a firmer ground the thesis of the common authorship of the works A great controversy centres round the equally vexed question of the number and identity of his works A number of works are associated with his name in a bid to justify the statement of Rājasekhara who attributes the composition of three works to him without specifically naming them and there is general reluctance among scholars even to entertain the suggestion that the author might have written more than three works I have ventured to maintain in this regard that Daṇḍin wrote at least four books namely, *Daśakumāracarita Avanti sundarīkathā Kāvyādarśa* and *Dvisamdhanakāvya* now lost to us, and have tried to construe the statement of Rājaśekhara in

the new light that the three *prabandhas* or poetical compositions of Daṇḍin (excluding the *Kāvyādarśa* which is a scientific treatise on the theory of poetry) are famous in the three worlds Both internal and external evidences have been brought to bear upon the theory

Although scholars are unanimous on the point that the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* and the *Uttarapīṭhikā* do not form parts of the original *Daśakumāracarita*, no satisfactory explanation of the mystery as to how the *pīṭhikās* got appended to the original work of the author has been given so far I have carefully examined the various aspects of the riddle and, taking them into consideration, have tried to solve it, and have also given the detailed plan of the original work which I have suggested had ten *ucchvāsas* (and not the present eight only) besides a prologue and an epilogue

In determining the date of Dandin the question of his relative chronological position with Bhamaha, which has long been a subject of heated discussion, has been thoroughly thrashed out I have maintained the theory of Daṇḍin s priority to Bhamaha which I have substantiated with fresh evidences also Besides while discussing the rhetorical doctrines of Daṇḍin in the second part I have adduced a number of important points whereby the writer s chronological precedence over Bhamaha who often represents more advanced views on certain concepts of Poetics gets additional support

Apart from the autobiographical sketch given in the introduction to the story of Avantisundari the various traditions along with the internal evidence have been fully utilised to form a general impression about the life and the personality of the poet

The second part deals with Daṇḍin as a rhetorician in nine chapters referring to the various aspects of the subject As an introduction to the various concepts and theories of Poetics appearing in Daṇḍin s work a short history of the beginnings and the early traditions of Sanskrit Poetics has been given Besides a brief reference to the writer s general rhetorical doctrines the theories of the *margas*, their constituent *gunas*, the *doṣas* and the *alamkaras* appearing in him for the first time in a

somewhat developed form, have been dealt with in detail In discussing his rhetorical doctrines, a thoroughly historical method has been followed so that we are able to apprehend the origin and early as well as later development of the different concepts of Poetics, besides knowing its form or conception in Daṇḍin and to determine what his own contribution to the study is Generally Dandin s doctrines have been traced back to Bharata s work and wherever possible to even earlier works on Grammar and Etymology and have been followed down to the works of Mammata Visvanātha and Jagannatha, through the intermediary manuals of comparatively early writers like Bhāmaha, Udbhata, Vāmana and Rudrata Thus an attempt has been made to present an historical analysis of the main doctrines of Poetics appearing in Dandin's work With regard to the poetic figures which has been dealt with individually with a brief reference to their conceptual position in the earlier and the later theory the attempt may claim to be novel The principles of *rasa aucitya dhvani* and *vakrokti* which have been either anticipated or referred to in passing by Dandin and which appear in later theory in their self conscious or fully developed form have also been examined At the end the writer s place in the history of Sanskrit Poetics has been determined with a general reference to his important contributions to the study of the science as also to his outstanding achievements in the field

The prevalent view that Dandin belongs essentially to the *riti* school and gives the *alamkaras* only a secondary place in his scheme and thus falls in line with Vāmana as distinct from that of Udbhata and Rudraṭa to whose line of thought Bhāmaha his opponent affiliates himself has been examined afresh and it has been maintained that Daṇḍin is as forceful a propounder of the *alamkāra* theory as that of the *mārga* doctrine and that he cannot be exclusively associated with either of the two schools It has been emphasised in this regard that his differences with Bhāmaha refer to the superficial details with regard to admissibility of certain poetic figures as such, or to questions not connected with the *alamkāra* theory, but never to the basic standpoint on the prominence of the *alamkāras* in poetry, which both of them assert with equal force and zeal

The third part makes a critical appraisal of Daṇḍin as a writer of prose *kāvya*. In the first two chapters, the origin and early development of prose and prose *kavyas* in Sanskrit and the chief trends and tendencies of the writers of the time as also the main characteristics and achievements of the age have been detailed. This has been done with a view to providing a requisite background and a right perspective for the proper assessment of Daṇḍin's art and style in his prose romances, which has been attempted in the remaining two chapters.

Unfortunately, we do not possess his fourth book, a poem in *double entendre* dealing simultaneously with the stories of the two Epics. Had it been available today, it would have enabled us to have a fuller view of his poetic art and style.

The *Avantisundarīkatha* also is available to us in broken form, though we are able to gather a fairly comprehensive idea of his art and style in the work. The *Avantisundarīkathasāra* an anonymous summary of the work in verse, has been extensively utilised for additional information and also for complementing the broken portions and correcting the erroneous readings. A number of corrections have been suggested in the *Avantisundarīkatha* during the discussion about its poetic art and diction.

At the end there are some appendices which supplement, by providing comparative data of manifold importance, the discussions on various questions relating to the life and works of the writer.

It has been my endeavour to present my studies in Daṇḍin in a most comprehensive manner covering all the important aspects of the writer. In discussing the various problems of the study I have followed a thoroughly critical and comparative method and have tried to settle the vexed questions as best as I could, fully conscious at the same time of the fact that no one can claim to have said the last word on a subject. While examining the different views of scholars on controversial issues, I have cared to present their viewpoint, along with the arguments advanced by them in full detail. No conclusion has been arrived at without the sound basis of solid evidences and convincing arguments, and no final reply has been ventured on matters

where it was deemed hazardous to make a positive thesis in the paucity of affirmative or corroborative evidence

While going through the valuable works of the scholars, I painfully noticed that some of them were not fully documented, with the result that the findings contained therein could not be utilised in full In fact, a quotation or statement without a full reference to the original source has little value I have constantly kept this fact in mind, and have tried to make the work as fully documented as possible Of course, this has considerably increased the volume of the work, but there could be no escape from it The footnotes, besides giving sufficient references to the original sources, also contain additional information of allied nature and of corroborative value

In the end, I most humbly and gratefully acknowledge the help and inspiration I received from the works of the scholars—both eastern and western, which I went through or referred to occasionally The *Bibliography* gives a list of such works

It is my pleasant duty to express my gratefulness to Dr D N Shukla, Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Panjab University, Chandigarh, for his kind guidance and valuable suggestions

My grateful thanks are due also to Messrs Mehar Chand Lachhman Das Oriental Publishers, who have taken great pains in carrying out the publication of this book

Department of Sanskrit,
Punjabi University, Patiala *D K GUPTA*
December, 1969

CONTENTS

APPENDICES (401-26)

P, G SECTION

ABBREVIATIONS

(A) *WORKS, JOURNALS AND SERIES*

AB	*Abhinavabhāratī*
ABORI	*Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute*
Agni-P	*Agni-Purāṇa*
AI	*Ancient India*
AIK	*Age of the Imperial Kanauj*
Ait Br	*Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*
Amara	*Amarakośa*
AOR	*Annals of Oriental Research* Madras
Āp DhS	*Āpastamba Dharmasūtra*
Apte	Apte s *Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary*
AS	*Alaṃkārasarvasva*
ASC	*Abhijñānaśakuntalacarcā*
ASK	*Avantisundarīkathā*
ASKS	*Avantisundarīkathāsāra*
ASL	*Aspects of Sanskrit Literature*
AVC	*Aucityavicāracarcā*
Bālac	*Bālacarita*
Bhand Com Vol	*Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume*
Bhaṭṭi	*Bhaṭṭikāvya (Rāvaṇavadha)*
Bhūṣ	*Bhūṣaṇā* (a comm on DKC)
BK	*Bṛhatkathā*
BKAl	Bhāmaha s *Kāvyālaṃkāra*
BKB	*Bhāratīya Kāvyaśāstra kī Bhūmikā*
BKM	*Bṛhatkathāmañjarī*
BNS	Bharata s *Nāṭyaśāstra*
BORI	Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute Poona
BS	*Bṛhatsaṃhitā*
BSK	*Bhāratīya Sāhityaśāstra aur Kāvyālaṃkāra*
BSOS	*Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*
Buddh	*Buddhacarita*
CA	*(The) Classical Age*
CAAA	*Campūkāvya kā Ālocanātmaka evam Aitihāsika Adhyayana*

Candrā	*Candraloka*
Caru	*Cārudatta*
ChSS	Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Varanasi
ChUp	*Chandogya Upanisad*
CII	*Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*
CRG	*Concept of Riti and Gunas*
CSD	*A Cultural Study of Dandin* (now planned as *Society and Culture in the Time of Dandin*)
CSL	*Classical Sanskrit Literature*
Dec Coll Coll	*Deccan College Collections*, Poona
DhA	*Dhvanyaloka*
DhAL	*Dhvanyalokalocana*
DKC	*Dasakumāracarita*
DKK	*Dasakumarakathā*
DR	*Dasarupaka*
DSK	*Dvisamdhanakāvya*
DSKI	*Ācarya Dandi evam Sanskrit Kāvyasastra ka Itihasa-darsana*
FHD	*Early History of Deccan*
EI	*Epigraphia Indica*
FIP	*Foundations of Indian Poetry*
GDRD	*Geographical Data of Raghuvamsa and Daśakumaracarita*
GGA	*Gottinger gelehrte Anzeigen*
GOS	Gaekwad Oriental Series, Baroda
HAI	*History of Ancient India*
Hcar	*Harsacarita*
HCSL	*History of Classical Sanskrit Literature*
HIL	*A History of Indian Literature*
HKAS	*Hindi Kavyalamkārasutra*
Hṛd	*Hṛdayamgamā* (a comm on KA)
HSA	*Harṣacarita eka Sāmskṛtika Adhyayana*
HSI	*A History of South India*
HSK	*Hindi Sahitya Kośa*
HSL	*(A) History of Sanskrit Literature*
HSP	*History of Sanskrit Poetics*
IA	*Indian Antiquary*
IHQ	*Indian Historical Quarterly*

Ind Off Cat	*India Office Catalogue*
IS	*Indische Studien*
ISHL	*Indian Studies in Honour of Lanman*
JA	*Journal Asiatique*
JBRAS	*Journal of the Bombay Branch of Royal Asiatic Society*
JIH	*Journal of Indian History*
JKUML	*Journal of the Travancore (Kerala) University Manuscripts Library*
JOR	*Journal of Oriental Research*
JRAS	*Journal of Royal Asiatic Society*
JUB	*Journal of University of Bombay*
KA	*Kavyādarśa*
Kād	*Kadambarī*
KAl	*Kāvyalamkāra*
Kām	*Kāmasutra* of Vatsyāyana
KAn	*Kavyānuśasana*
Kāś	*Kāśikā*
KASS	*Kavyalamkārasārasamgraha*
KASV	*Kavyālamkārasūtravṛtti*
Kauṭ	Kautilya's *Arthasāstra*
Kir	*Kirātārjunīya*
Kiṣk	*Kiṣkindhakānda* (of Rām)
KM	Kāvyamāla Series, Bombay
KMīm	*Kāvyamīmāmsā*
KNīt	*Kamandakiyanitisāra*
KPr	*Kavyaprakāśa*
KSA	*Kādambari eka Sāmskṛtika Adhyayana*
KSS	*Kathāsaritsāgara*
KTS	*Kāvyatattvasamikṣā*
Kum	*Kumārasambhava*
Kuval	*Kuvalayananda*
Laghu	*Laghudipika* (a comm on DKC)
Loc	*Locana* (a comm on DhA)
Mālat	*Malatimadhava*
Mālav	*Mālavikāgnimitra*
Mañju	*Mañjusrimūlakalpa*
Manu	*Manusmṛti*

MBhār	*Mahābhārata*
MBhās	*Mahabhāsya*
Megh	*Meghaduta*
Mrcch	*Mrcchakaṭika*
MSA	*Mānasollasa eka Samskṛtika Adhyayana*
Mud	*Mudraraksasa*
MV	*Madhurāvijaya*
MW	M Monier-Williams *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*
Nais	*Naisadhiyacarita*
NHSL	*A New History of Sanskrit Literature*
Nigh	*Nighaṇṭu*
Nir	*Nirukta*
NR	*Number of Rasas*
NSP	Nirnaya Sagar Press Bombay
Pada	*Padacandrikā* (a comm on DKC)
Pan	Pānini s *Aṣṭadhyāyī*
Pañc	*Pañcatantra*
Pañcas	*Pañcasayaka*
PB	*Panini-kalina Bharatavarṣa*
PKB	*Patañjali-kalina Bhārata*
PP	*Purvapiṭhikā*
Pratāp	*Pratāparudrayasobhuṣana*
PVD	*Purvavṛttāntadarsana*
QJMS	*Quarterly Journal of Mythical Society*
Ragh	*Raghuvamsa*
Ram	*Rāmayana*
Rati	*Ratirahasya*
Ratra	*Ratnasri* (a comm on KA)
RG	*Rasagangadhara*
RKAl	Rudrata s *Kavyalamkāra*
Śak	*Śakuntala (Abhijñāna-)*
SALCS	*Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit*
Saṁ	*Samgitaratnakara*
Śārng	*Śarngadharapaddhati*
Saund	*Saundarananda*
SBA	*Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*
ŚBr	*Śatapatha Brahmana*

SCAS	*Some Concepts of the Alaṁkāraśastra*
SD	*Sāhityadarpana*
SDr	*Sanskrit Drama*
Setu	*Setubandha*
SI	*Select Inscriptions*
SICH	*Studies in Indian Cultural History*
Śiś	*Śiśupalavadha*
SKA	*Sarasvatikaṇṭhabharana*
SKD	*Śabdakalpadruma*
SP	*Sanskrit Poetics*
SPA	*Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
ŚPr	*Śṛṅgāraprakāśa*
SPSA	*Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetics*
SPSP	*Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics*
Śrut	*Śrutānupālini* (a comm on KA)
SSI	*Sanskrit Sāhitya kā Itihāsa*
SU	*Studies in the Upapuranas*
Subh Pr	*Subhāṣita prabandha*
Sūkti	*Suktimuktāvali*
Svap	*Svapnavasavadatta*
Taitt Ā	*Taittirīya Āraṇyaka*
Taruṇa	Taruṇavācaspati's comm on KA
TSS	Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Trivandrum
UP	*Uttarapiṭhikā*
Uttar	*Uttararamacarita*
Vākya	*Vākyapadīya*
Vās	*Vāsavadattā*
Vikr	*Vikramorvaśīya*
Viṣṇu	*Viṣṇudharmottarapurāna*
VJ	*Vakroktijivita*
VV	*Vyaktiviveka*
WZKM	*Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
Yājñ	*Yājñavalkyasmṛti*
ZDMG	*Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*

(B) GENERAL

Ā	*Ātmanepada*
acc	according
Acc	Accusative (case)
App	Appendix
Bibliog	Bibliography
cat	catalogue
cent	century
ch	chapter
char	character (in the *Index*)
comm	commentary commentator
def	defect (in the *Index*)
desc	description
dict	dictionary
Eng	English
esp	especially
ex	example
f	following prose portion
ff	following (pages or verses)
fig	figure (in the *Index*)
fn	footnote
fore	foreword
insc	inscription
intro	introduction introductory
k	*karika*
lib	library
lit	literature, literally
Loc	Locative (case)
MS	manuscript (*pl* MSS)
opt	optional optionally
p	page (*pl* pp)
para	paragraph
pref	preface
pt	part
ref	reference
Sans	Sanskrit
trans	translation
ucch	ucchvāsa (chapter)
v	verse (*pl* vs)

PART I

DANDIN AND HIS WORKS

Dandin occupies an important place in Sanskrit literature both as a rhetorician and as a writer of prose fiction He is one of the oldest exponents of Sanskrit Poetics, while his place in the field of prose comes with Subandhu and Bāna whom he follows chronologically He also succeeds the poetry of Kālidasa and Bhāravi, besides that of Aśvaghosa and Bhāsa Thus he enjoys the privilege of inheriting the great traditions of Sanskrit *kāvya* which he on his part, enriches profusely with his own precious contributions in the sphere both of *kāvya* and the science of *kavya* It is unfortunate however that we do not possess much information regarding his age and life and personality What is still more deplorable is that there is no unanimity even with regard to his writings While, on one hand, a number of books are attributed to him on slender grounds on the other, the common authorship of the works traditionally ascribed to him is doubted by some scholars who propound thereby, directly or indirectly the theory of more than one Daṇḍin We shall discuss in the following chapters the problems relating to the identity of our author, his works, his period as well as his personality, and try to solve them within, of course, the limits of the available evidence

CHAPTER I

IDENTITY OF DANDIN

Tradition ascribes, though individually, as we shall see below, the composition of the *Kāvyādarsa* *Dasakumāracarita*, *Avantisundarikathā* and *Dvisamdhāna kāvya* to Daṇḍin But some scholars doubt the common authorship of all these works on various grounds, and are inclined to hold that there were more than one Dandin Of course, there is nothing that may preclude the possibility of the existence of two or even more authors bearing the name *Dandin* Besides, the name itself, which is employed to designate a religious mendicant of a certain order, can be taken as S K De suggests, as a title capable of being applied to more than one person [1] But the question is whether there is ample ground for doubting the traditional ascription or there is any substantial evidence in support of the existence of authors more than one, holding the name or title of *Dandin* According to G J Agashe, there were three Daṇḍins, *viz* (1) Dandin the critic, better known as Ācārya Dandin (2) Daṇḍin, the author of the *Dasakumāracarita* and (3) the poet Dandin [2] In his view the author of the *Daśa kumaracarita* could not have been the same Dandin who wrote the *Kavyadarsa* because the two works are widely divergent in style and purity of language and in general tenor and in this contention, he is supported by K P Trivedi and S K De [3]

Agashe[4] argued that the author of the *Kāvyādarsa* was a fastidious critic who had refined notions about style and its functions in poetry and was a literary purist who warned all aspirants of poetic fame against connivance at even the most trivial flaw which he compared to a spot of white leprosy on

---

1 HSL p 208

2 Cp DKC ed Agashe Intro p lxviii

3 Cp Trivedi Pratap Intro p xxxi De HSL pp 208 9

4 Cp *op cit* p xxv ff

the beautiful person'[1] while in the *Daśakumāracarita*, we come across numerous faults in the matter of grammar and poetics and as regards the general tenor of the stories He cited a number of instances of faulty grammar, irregular syntax and unfamiliar use and misuse of words[2] and made an elaborate plea for his contention But as A B Keith pointed out rightly, most of the alleged errors may easily be defended or at least are of the type which other poets permit themselves[3] In fact, such forms as *ahladisata* and *āsvadayitum*,[4] such constructions as *enam anurakta*[5] and such syntax as in मरीचि वेदाङ्गच्छाद् उत्थाय पुन प्रतितप्ततप प्रभावप्रत्यापन्न दिव्यचक्षुषम् उपसगम्य तेनास्म्येवभूत स्वदशाम् प्रवगमित[6] etc are grammatically faultless, while some other errors can plausibly be taken as scribal mistakes[7] The use of plural for singular in *dayita naḥ kaṭakalekhā* has been made delibera tely and rather helplessly by the author in order to avoid the labial *mama*[8] in the seventh *ucchvasa* which is his *tour de force* A few errors like *aham cakame* etc[9] are, of course serious But we should not expect an absolute purity of language from poets who must be given some licence Even Daṇḍin the so called severe critic, while describing the grammatical fault (*śabdahina*) gives some concession to the poets 'whose minds are naturally inattentive to the rules of grammar and declares that their

1 KA I 7 स्याद् वपु सुदरमपि श्वित्रेणकेन दुर्भगम् ।

2 Cp below pt III ch IV

3 HSL p 296

4 DKC pp 138 and 194 respectively the latter is √*svad* Ā of X class

5 DKC p 57 cp Apte giving both Acc and Loc with *anurakta* also cp Śāk VI 21 Mrcch I Mud I 19 f (Loc)

6 DKC pp 100–1 In this sentence *upasamgamya* could better be replaced by *upasamgataḥ* But the sentence as it is is not objec tionable

7 E g *cumbayitum* (DKC p 55) for *cumbitum upaguhya* (p 154) for *upaguhya asukhayiṣata* (p 138) for *asukhāyiṣata* The faulty usage *rameyam* (p 112) is absent in the v l In the sentence *priyasakhim* etc (p 103) *vasumatim* might have originally followed *priyasakhim* and in *punar aham* etc (p 107) there may have been *avalam* after *pratikṛtim*

8 DKC p 177

9 Cp *ib* p 126 (where the use of Perfect in First Person is faulty)

incorrect usages like *dakṣiṇādrer upasaran* for *dakṣiṇādrim upasaran* do not spoil altogether the charm of their poetry[1] As regards the unfamiliar use and misuse of words, it may be pointed out that the author of the romance who possessed a realistic outlook towards language as towards life presents certain interesting phrases and idioms of his day and, as a matter of fact, the so called wrong uses of words[2] are fine examples of his linguistic usage The use of *cillikalata* for *bhrulata* has been made evidently to avoid a labial letter in the seventh *ucchvasa* while the vocative *jagadiṣa* well befits the context[3] With regard to the use of *brahmana bruva* for the *kṣatriya* Rajavāhana, it may be remarked that the fact of his being a *kṣatriya* had not been known to the king Caṇḍavarman who took him to be a *brahmana* on account of his apparent religious hypocrisy[4]

The second argument of Agashe is that Daṇḍin of the *Kāvyadarsa* regards the force (*ojas*) consisting in the employment of lengthy compounds, as the soul of prose,[5] while the author of the *Daśakumāracarita* seldom uses long compounds, except while describing the personal charms of heroine or some particular pose or when depicting some picturesque scene[6]

Here it may be noted that the phrase *samasabhuyastva* really means the use of a large number of compounds and not necessarily, of lengthy compounds, and we come across a considerable number of them in the romance scattered beautifully all over the work It may be recalled here that

---

1 KA III 150 1 it may b noted that Daṇḍin quotes as grammatical faults such obvious mistakes as *avate* for *avati* *bhavate bāhuh* for *bhavato bāhuh* and *mahārajan* for *mahārāja* cp *ib* III 149

2 Cp below pt III ch IV for such usages as *pravṛtte* (DKC p 64) *preṣaniyam* (p 130) and *upari* (p 168) etc

3 Cp *cillikālatā ib* p 174 and *jagadīśa* p 184

4 The current PP and PVD indicate this fact which might b acc to the original text cp p 42 PVD p 155 The word ther for has been used in the sense of a *brāhmana* in name only and not in the sense of a *kṣatriya* pretending to be a *brāhmana* as Agashe thought

5 1 80 see below pt II

6 Cp the depiction of Ambālikā (p 97) Kandukāvati (p 152) or of the spring season (p 177) and the sun (pp 180 I) see below pt III also

Dandin notices in various pieces of prose *kāvya* prevalent in his time different varieties of *samāsabhuyastva* according as the compounds occur in abundance, rarity or in moderate number[1] Besides, he remarks that the Vaidarbhas perfer that quality of force (*ojas*) which is not confused with lengthy com pounds[2] This is exactly what we find in the *Dasakumāracarita*

Agashe further argued that the author of the *Kavyādarsa* could not have indulged in the literary *tour de force* of which the seventh *ucchvasa* of the *Dasakumāracarita*[3] is a notable example In this regard it may be said that the literary feat of the romance is quite in keeping with the dictum of *Kāvyādarśa* which, while describing the *citrālamkaras* in detail refers to the feats of restriction of the places of articulation of sounds (*sthana niyama*) in poetry and cites a verse without labial letters alongwith those without cerebral and labial syllables, without palatal, cerebral and labial letters and a verse containing only the guttural ones[4] As a matter of fact, Dandin was fond of employing such literary feats and in his other writings also we find fine examples of such stupendous feats[5]

The next argument advanced by Agashe is that the author of the *Kavyādarsa* was a purist both in style and sentiment and, according to him, a *kavya* should deal with a good subject (*sadasraya*) bearing the fruit of the fourfold object of life, and should depict a noble hero[6] Further it is the absence of vulgarity of expression which formed in his view the essence of poetic delight[7] But contrary to the above dicta, the predomi nant incidents in the stories of *Daśakumāracarita* consist of gambling burglary impersonation murder abduction and

1 KA I 31 see below also
2 KA I 83-4
3 Cp the story of Mantragupta (pp 172 86) which contains no labial letter see below pt III ch IV
4 KA III 88-91 cp below pt II also
5 Cp the story of Somadatta in ASK (cp ASKS VII 15-48) the DSK a lost poem in *double etendre* also must have been a good example of literary *tour de force* see below for detail
6 KA I 15 cp below pt II also
7 KA I 62 3 also I 95

illicit love, and the romance contains a number of passages which savour of bad taste [1]

In this respect, it may be said that Daṇḍin who in his *Kavyādarsa* reiterated the precepts of his predecessors on Poetics perhaps adopted, along with Bhāmaha, the definition of *kāvya* also from previous works,[3] and it is noteworthy that the word *sadasraya* occurs both in Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha It is not, therefore fair to apply the definition of *kavya* of the theorist to his romance in all its details It is, however, worth while to note that Daṇḍin, the theorist declares such subjects as drinking amorous pleasure and abduction of a girl as incidents to be depicted in a *kavya*[4] A good number of examples given in the *Kavyadarśa* refer, directly or indirectly, to sexual enjoyment, illicit love, confidential whisper and nailmark in amorous play and the love sport of pigeons[5] There are, in fact, numerous instances in the work, which can be labelled as being as offensive as some of the passages of *Daśakumāracarita*[6] Agashe particularly refers to the passage त्वाम् मयम् मावद्धाञ्जलि दासजनस्तम इमम् मथम् मथयते । स्वपिहि मया सह सुरत व्यतिकरखिन्नव मा मैवम् ॥ of *Dasakumaracarita*, and equates it with कन्ये वामयमान मा न त्व कामयसे कथम् । of *Kavyādarśa*, which the critic cites as an example of indecent expression[7] But it may be noted that he gives the succeeding verse काम कन्दपचाण्डालो मयि वामाक्षि निदय । त्वयि निभत्सरो दिष्टया, which contains the same idea, though expressed in a good manner, as an instance of decency of sense[8] What he seems, therefore, to emphasize is that the ideas should be expressed by the suggestive method and not in a rough manner The

1 Cp esp DKC pp 99 115 see also pt III ch III
2 KA I 2
3 KA I 14-5 also cp KAL I 19
4 KA I 16 29 65
5 Cp (a) KA II 107 207 264 269 297 III 32 41 76 109 119 121 etc, (b) *ib* II 266 297, III 74 76 109 134 187 etc, (c) *ib* III 11 (d) *ib* II 289 (e) *ib* II 10 ch also DKC p 94
6 Cp KA I 87 II 266 297 III 33 109 119 etc
7 Cp DKC p 99, KA I 63
8 KA I 64 also cp Kane HSP pp 94-5

depiction of Apahāravarman spitting on the wall after chewing betel leaf for making a painting,[1] to which also Agashe refers, is of course indecent but the act may be excused on the plea that the hero could not help doing it, as he was strongly urged by the passion of love and was eager to paint the *cakravāka* couple the symbol of constancy of love in the reddish hue which he might not have found in the colour box lying nearby

Agashe s next argument appertains to the alleged long gap between the composition of the two works, for he holds that the *Dasakumaracarita* was written as late as 12th century A D while the *Kavyadarsa* is a much earlier work and can be assigned roughly to the close of 7th or the beginning of 8th century A D[3]

The date however assigned by him to the romance is simply untenable as we shall see below and no scholar today patronises the theory of such a late date of the work It may be noted that S K De who otherwise supports Agashe's hypothesis of the two works having come from different pens[4], holds that the *Dasakumaracarita* belongs to a period much earlier than what is possible to assign to the *Kāvyadarśa*[5] S K De s opinion on the date of the romance is based on M Collins theory that the geographical data of the *Daśakumara carita* reveal a state of things which existed in a period anterior to the date of Harṣavardhana[6] But as V V Mirashi has shown on the basis of the historical data contained in the last *ucchvasa* of *Daśakumaracarita* the work might have been composed in the second half of seventh century A D[7] a date assigned by Agashe to the *Kavyadarsa* S K De places

1 DKC p 99

2 Cp Ragh II 24 Kād para 239 red hue also signifies love (*anurāga*) the painting of the picture is in conformity with the dictum of Kām V 6 19 a so cp Agashe s notes on DKC p 99 (his ed p 63)

3 Cp DKC Intro pp xxxvi xlvii *see below for the discussion of his* arguments

4 HSL pp 207 8

5 Cp *op cit* p 209

6 Cp Mark Collins GDRD pp 9 ff

7 ABORI XXVI pp 20-31 also see below ch III

Kāvyādarśa, on the presumption that Bhāmaha preceded Daṇḍin, in the beginning of 8th century,[1] a date not far off from the period which we assign to the romance In fact, even on independent examination of the two works, we arrive approximately at the same date, *viz*, the end of 7th century or the commencement of the following century A D, for their composition [2]

The argument that the *Kavyadarsa* mentions a collyrium which makes one invisible, while *Daśakumāracarita* speaks of an ointment possessing the property of making the user look like an ape,[3] and that in the former, the idea is put elegantly and grammatically, while in the latter, the same is expressed clumsily and ungrammatically, carries little weight for we know of collyriums having different properties[4] and there is nothing inelegant or ungrammatical in the passage from *Daśakumāra carita* What is interesting to note is that there is close resemblance of reading in the relevant passages of the two works[5] which may point to their common authorship Besides, there are numerous instances where verbal resemblance is so close and striking[6] that there can be little doubt that both the works belong to one and the same Daṇḍin

The *Dasakumaracarita,* though exhibiting some of the characteristics of Sanskrit prose *kavya* does not conform strictly to all the requirements of the theorists [7] This disregard of convention in practice is quite in keeping with the precept of the *Kavyādarsa* which makes a strong plea for the obliteration of distinctions between *kathā* and *ākhyāyika,*[8] and the fact supports the identity of the authors of the two works Again the adoption of Vaidarbha *marga* in the *Daśakumāracarita*

---

1 HSL p 209
2 See below, ch III for the discussion of the question
3 Cp KA II 151 DKC p 153
4 Cp PP p 36 for *siddhāñjana* enabling the eyes to see the desired spots cp ASKS VI 50 also cp PP p 53
5 Cp *yalaktanetram* KA II 151 with *tadaktanetrayā* DKC p 153
6 See App I
7 See below, pt III
8 Cp KA I 25 28 also cp below pt II

accords well with the high exaltation of that style in the *Kāvyādarśa*[1] That both the works display intimate familiarity with southern places and definitely belong to the South[2] also points to the same conclusion

It is admitted that the general tenor of the *Daśakumāracarita* is not sober or serious and that the romance seems to advocate the theory of ends justifying means[3] But in this respect it may be remarked that a poet is not expected to follow necessarily his precepts in practice, if perchance he is a theorist also Even if the style and tenor of the work do not concord in all details with some of the rules of the *Kavyadarśa*, yet, as we have seen the actual disparity is not very great, even if it refers, as S K. De would say to niceties of diction and taste and general outlook[4] And this negligible divergence too, can be explained away if we bear in mind the bare fact that there must need be a gulf however small between precept and practice—a fact which has been admitted by all literary critics As pointed out by P V Kane Mahimabhatta says 'One should not doubt how a critic himself without a restraint in his poetic compositions can preach others Because a physician, himself taking an unwholesome diet, prevents others from doing so'[5] Similarly Kṣemendra as a critic finds faults with his own poetic compositions[6]

Moreover it is perfectly possible or rather probable that the *Daśakumaracarita* came from the youth of Danḍin, naturally interested in the charms and follies of romantic love, but not a consummate writer, while the *Kavyadrasa* was composed in his later life of richer studies and riper judgement[7] This

1 Cp KA I 41 42 60 83-4 etc for Vaidarbha diction in DKC see below pt III
2 Cp KA III 114 and Taruna thereon also III 165 6 cp below ch IV
3 See DKC p 122 cp below pt III ch III
4 HSL p 203
5 VV p 37 cp Kane HSP p 94
6 AVC *kārikās* 20-1 33 35
7 Cp M R Kale DKC, Intro p xi Kane HSP pp 94-5 Keith HSL p 296 also cp below

supposition is borne out by the fact that while the colophons in the *Kāvyādarśa* (and also in *Avantisundarīkathā*) mention the author as *Ācārya* Daṇḍin those in the *Daśakumāracarita* have simply Daṇḍin

When S K De contends that there is nothing immature in either work,[1] he means that the disparity between the two works represents definitely two different minds, both mature But as a matter of fact, when we observe the close affinity on many points between the two works with, of course, a slight divergence in the matter of purity of diction and general tenor we arrive at the natural conclusion that the works represent two distinct stages of literary and intellectual development of one and the same author, the romance exhibiting the earlier and more jovial mood and the *Kāvyādarśa* displaying the latter and more serious and refined state of mind with a fuller mastery over style, language and diction The hypothesis, therefore, of the non identity of the authors of *Kāvyādarśa* and *Daśakumāracarita* does not stand a critical examination

As noted above, Agashe recognised also a third Daṇḍin, a poet, whom he differentiated from the theorist as well as from the romancer According to him, it was this poet Daṇḍin who wrote the trio of works, referred to by Rājaśekhara His main arguments with regard to this theory are

1 Some citations ascribed to Daṇḍin in *Śṛṅgāratilaka*, *Saduktikarṇāmṛta*, *Subhāṣitamuktāvalī* and *Padyāvenī* which we do not come across in the *Kāvyādarśa*, justify the inference of a poet named Daṇḍin

2 The verses illustrating the literary canons in *Kāvyādarśa*, apart from the fact that most of them are not originally his,[2] cannot entitle their author to be recognised as a great poet At least, they do not merit the high flown encomiums we meet with in references to Daṇḍin [3]

3 A famous verse refers to, along with the peculiar

---

1 HSL p 208

2 Cp Agashe *op cit* pp lxiii lxiv see below also

3 Cp for detail, *ibid* pp liii lvi cp App V

4 Cp below pt III cp IV

excellences of Kālidasa Bharavi and Māgha—all poets—Dandin s quality of felicity of diction (*padalalitya*)[1] The reference here must be to a poet Dandin, other than the author of the *Kavyadarsa* in which we cannot find this quality Nor prose work could have been meant Bana's works claiming superiority to *Daśakumaracarita*

4 The colophon of the *Kāvyādarsa* describes the author as *Ācārya Dandin* an appellation which all subsequent writers have confirmed by tradition to distinguish him from his namesake the poet[2]

These arguments however, need not point to a separate Dandin Even if we admit that the *Kāvyādarśa* and the romance do not deserve the high panegyrics referred to above, there is no denying the fact that every author is known to have written works of varying degrees of excellence and perfection[3] and in the present case, it is more plausible to argue that the same Dandin as wrote the above two works also composed some other work or works, now lost on which the high eulogies might have been based Fortunately, we know of a lost work, a poem in *double entendre* (*dvisamdhanakavya*) ascribed to Dandin by Bhoja in his *Śṛngaraprakāśa* and scholars have accepted it as the requisite third work of Dandin[4] It may be pointed out here that the literary feats expounded in *Kavyādarśa* and employed in *Dasakumaracarita* well befit his authorship of the poem in *double entendre*[5] It may be this *kāvya* of Daṇḍin from which some verses might have been quoted in the anthologies and which taken with his other works elicited the words of high praise especially referring to his felicity of expression, from his admirers who ranked him with Kalidāsa We need not, therefore, embark on the unwarranted theory of a separate

1 Cp below pt III ch IV
2 Cp Agashe *op cit* p lvi
3 Cp also Kale *op cit* p x
4 [illegible] 117
5 [illegible] Sastri
ASKS Intro p v

Daṇḍin the poet, as distinct from *Ācārya* Daṇḍin and Daṇḍin, the prose-writer It may be important to note in this connection that the poetess Gangādevi eulogises Daṇḍin, the *Ācārya*, as a poet of a high calibre [1] indicating thereby that *Ācārya* Daṇḍin is the same as Daṇḍin, the poet Again the colophon of the *Avantisundarīkathā*, mentioning its author as *Ācārya* Daṇḍin, points to the tradition of recognising Daṇḍin and *Ācārya* Daṇḍin as identical On the other hand, Daṇḍin, the *Ācārya*, has been referred to simply as Daṇḍin also by later poets and writers on Poetics,[2] and not always as *Ācārya* Daṇḍin as Agashe thought

The discovery of *Avantisundarīkathā*[3] in 1919 has given the whole problem a new turn Now, when we have already got the required number of works of Daṇḍin as referred to by Rājaśekhara, some difficulty is felt as to how to accommodate a fourth book in the list We shall refer to this question later while discussing the works of Daṇḍin Suffice it to say here that the difficulty is not at all real

The main ground on which S K De and, following him some other scholars do not accept the common authorship of the *Daśakumāracarita* and *Avantisundarīkathā* and for that reason Daṇḍin s authorship of the latter is the great divergence of style between the two works While refuting the view of some scholars that the *Daśakumāracarita* originally formed a part of *Avantisundarīkathā* and that the extant portion of the latter is the original prelude to the story of Rājavāhana and his friends De remarks that if they are indeed by the same author and formed part of the same work, one should expect an evenness of style in the two, unless it is presumed without good

1 MV I 10 cp below also

2 Cp Vijjakā (in Sārṅg No 108) वृथैव दण्डिना प्रोक्तं सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती, cp KA I 1 सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती, Siyabas-*lakara* I 2 Namisādhu on RKAl I 2 Pratihārendurāja in KASS p 23 Abhinava in AB VI Pratāp I 10 f DhAL III 7 Māṇikyacandra on KPr (Mysore ed p 292) Vāgbhaṭa in *Kāvyānuśāsanavṛtti* p 31 Viśvanātha (SD VI 336) mentions him both as Daṇḍin and Daṇḍyācārya Jagaddhara on Mālat refers to him as Daṇḍin as many as six times

3 First published in 1924 A fuller MS of the work has been published in 1954 from Trivandrum see Bibliog

grounds that the author intended a more elaborate and florid style for the prelude and simpler and more vigorous style for the work itself[1] Following the line of argument of De, A B Keith opined that if a Dandin wrote the *Avantisundarī katha*, he was assuredly not the author of the *Daśakumāracarita*[2]

While it must be confessed that the divergence of style and manner of story telling between the two works is indeed great and that it presents real difficulty in regarding the two as having originally formed parts of one and the same work, the fact should not be taken to suggest that the two works could not have come from one and the same pen We notice in the literary field instances where there is difference, and at times a marked difference, between the style of two works written by the same writer at two different periods of his literary career We see for instance a wide gulf of style between the *Rtusamhara* and the *Abhijñanasakuntala* of Kālidāsa the earlier work representing his youthful spirit and the latter his mature mind[3] A similar gap can be observed between the earlier and later writings of Bhasa and Bhavabhuti or of Virgil, Shakespeare, Tennyson and Goethe In fact such divergence is but natural for there is all the difference between the youth and the maturity of a man The great writers who work steadily at their art are able to create in their ripe age structures which naturally make their earlier works look quite different In the present case the wide gulf of style and manner of story telling between the two romances can well be accounted for by the supposition (which is by no means unfounded) that there might have been a long gap of time may be of thirty years or even more between the composition of the two works While the *Dasakumāracarita* reflects the writer s spirit of youth, his admiration for love and beauty and his amusing sense of humour and describes the life around him in a light hearted manner, there is an unmistakable trait of serious and sober mood in the other work wherein he appears as an indifferent spectator of youth

1 Cp IHQ III pp 395 ff ASL p 303
2 HSL pref p xvi
3 Cp A B Keith HSL pp 82 3

and romance The graphic description, in the *Avantisundarīkathā*[1] of the old age, which clearly betrays an element of personal touch, also supports the view that it has come from the writer in his ripe old age

During the long gap the author might have allowed himself to be strongly influenced in general by the literary tendencies of the age which evidently patronised ornate style and diction, and, in particular, by the laboured style of the works of Subandhu and Bāna He might have been led by the desire to follow the artificialities and mannerisms of the age in his later work in order to come up to the literary aspirations of the time His study of poetics also seems to have made an impact on his literary pursuits, resulting on one hand, into his composition of the *Kavyādarsa* and, on the other, into his general preference for elaborate diction It may be for this reason that while *Daśakumaracarita* is characterised by a freedom from poetic ambitions and literary conventions, the later romance is marked by a highly flavoured and artificial manner of story-telling vying with that of *Vāsavadattā* and *Kādambari*

It may, however be made clear that the difference of style in the two works chiefly refers to the external devices of story-telling and especially to the elaboration of the theme with episodic tales and descriptive matter, and that it seldom relates to what we may call diction or *riti* which is intrinsically of affinitive nature in the two romances It is to be particularly noted that both the works exhibit the general characteristics of the Vaidarbha diction with its ten qualities as enumerated in the *Kavyādarsa*[2] Again, like the rhetorician the author of *Avantisundarīkathā* pays his compliments to the Vaidarbha *mārga* and makes a hint that he has followed that path in the work[3] This diction of the Vaidarbhas possesses besides other *excellences, the quality of force (ojas), characterised by the use*

---

1 ASK pp 41 2 see below pt II ch IV
2 I 40-102
3 KA I 41, 42 etc. ASK Intro v 15 The use of the term *vartman* path for diction is noticeable here KA (I 42 92) also used the term along with its equivalents *mārga* and *paddhati*

of a good number of compounds not confused with lengthy ones [1]

The author of the *Kāvyadarsa* divides *ojas* into different forms according to the use of compounds which may be either frequent or rare or of moderate occurrence, with the remark that these varieties may be noticed in various species of prose *kavya* and as a matter of fact, he has employed the different varieties of *ojas* in his prose works It seems that while in *Dasakumaracarita* Dandin adopted the quality of *ojas* with rarity of compounds in his later and more ambitious work, *Avantisundarikatha* he preferred to employ the *guna* consisting of compounds in abundance or rather in their different forms The worst mannerisms of Bāna s work said to have been followed in *Avantisundarikatha* could scarcely have been termed as such in the age of Bāna and Dandin which was essentially characterised by the so called artificialities of style and diction Nor is it fair to say that the work represents this peculiar tendency of his age unsuccessfully In spite of the fragmentary nature of the text one cannot fail to see Dandin here in sweet diction picturesque characterisation and other features which one comes across in *Dasakumaracarita* Besides the writer here does not always indulge in effecting elaborate diction, of course there are long sentences strung with a number of epithets and compounds and a series of puns, but we also notice at places a simpler diction as also the charm of sententious expressions and vivid descriptions and picturesque scenes charged with rapidity of action [3]

It must be admitted however that while the earlier romance is free from the effect of leisurely manner of proceeding with the story and is ornamented quite sparingly the later romance suffers from lengthy digressions in the form of

---

1 KA I 80 83

2 KA I 81 It may be noted that Vādijanghāla hereon mentions ASK as an instance of *the ojas* indicating thereby that it employed *samāsabhuyastva* of different varieties

3 Cp ASK pp 13 23-4 40-1 47 57 9 73-4 etc also cp G H Sastri ASKS Intro p v

side tales and monotonous descriptions as also from over ornamentation But as we have said there is essential affinity between the two, as far as the employment of diction is concerned If the *Avantisundarīkathā* employs at times a laboured diction with long compounds and continuous chain of epithets adorned with poetic figures, the phenomenon is not altogether absent in the *Dasakumāracarita* either, which displays at places equally ornamented and laboured diction [1] On the other hand, instances can be cited from the *Avantisundarīkathā* where simple and lucid diction gets the upper hand of the laboured style [2]

The essential affinity that binds the two works together prominently refers, in general to the employment of diction and, in particular, to the use of idioms and phrases that are peculiar to the writer It may be particularly noted that the two romances deal with a common theme The question therefore, that may pertinently be asked is what made the author to choose the same theme for both his works ? One of the answers that may possibly be given to explain this peculiar phenomenon is that the author imbued with a spirit to follow the contemporary trends in literature and to come up to the set standard of literary composition wanted to elaborate the theme of his earlier work after the best literary fashion of the day, and undertook the arduous task in his later romance We shall have an occasion later to refer in detail to the other explanation of the uncommon phenomenon, given by some scholars, that the extant portion of the *Avantisundarīkathā* is the original prelude (*Pūrvapīṭhikā*) to the complete work of Daṇḍin of which the authentic *Daśakumāracarita*, according to them, formed the middle part, with an epilogue now lost to us [3] Still another conjecture[4] that some later writer ambitious of writing a romance in the approved vein of Bāṇa s works simply took the story of Avantisundarī from the original lost prelude to the

1 Cp esp DKC pp 96-8 176-7

2 ASK pp 12 13 23-4 58 9 etc

3 The view is held by V Raghavan G H Śastri and P V Kane see below

4 Cp S K De ASL p 306

Daśakumāracarita and embellished it in the approved fashion, does not stand for there is no positive evidence to support the view nor is it warranted by the circumstances

Apart from the common theme in the two works, which, of course, cannot in itself be taken to suggest their common authorship there are striking points of affinity between the two works, which we shall discuss below[1]

A close examination of the two romances from the point of view of diction presents certain peculiar features, peeping through them in the form of images, expressions and poetic embellishments which evidently appear to be favourite with their writer Thus the study reveals that the author had a fancy for certain imagery and had developed a peculiar manner of expression in the form of poetic figures and that his diction consisted of a large number of idioms and phrases and single words peculiar only to him It is some of these peculiarities of imagery and diction coinciding in the two romances that make us to believe that the tradition which attributes the composition of the two romances to Dandin is correct

The intrinsic unity running through the two works is all the more prominent at the occasions when a common or similar object is described or an identical situation is presented in them Some instances that strike us most may be cited here

1 A cloud with or sometimes without lightning on its lap is a picture favourite with the writer It occurs in a number of places in the form of an *upamana* to various objects Some instances would illustrate the poet s fancy for this particular phenomenon His emp'oyment of almost similar diction in such pictures in the two works is also noteworthy

The instances are

(i) इति प्रियोरसि प्रावृड इव नभस्युपास्तीर्णगुरुपयोधरमण्डला (प्रवर्तितगुदगे)[2] (DKC p 55)

(ii) आननैकसमुत्पालकलत्तं च विश्रब्धसुप्ताम् प्रतिधवलोत्तरच्छद-निमग्नप्रायैकपार्श्वतया चिरविलसनमदालसचला शरदम्भोधरोत्सङ्गशायिनीम इव

---

1 Also cp App II

2 Cp KA III 57 उरस्युपास्तीर्णपयोधरद्वय मया समालिङ्गयत जीवितेश्वर,

सौदामिनीम् (राजकन्याम) (DKC p 98)

(iii) घनदर्शितरागविभ्रमा (कन्दुकावती) विद्युल्लताम् इव विडम्बयन्ती (DKC p 152)

(iv) वारयुवतिभिराधूयमानचामराभि प्रावृण्मेघ इवोपान्तचलबलाका भिरभ्रमालोत्सगिनीभि सौदामिनीभिरुद्भासमान (राजहस) (ASK p 64)

(v) सौदामिनीम् इव जलदोत्सगाद् भ्रष्टाम् (मगधराजमहिषीम्) (ASK p 120)

(vi) बालातपरक्तशरदम्भोधरानुकारिणश्चामीकरविकटदण्डस्य (श्वेतातपत्रस्य) (ASK p 64)

(vii) प्रत्ययभङ्गुराभि सौदामिनीभिरिव घनागममधुकपिलशालिका (ASK p 144)

There is close affinity between the first two passages from the *Daśakumāracarita* and the last three from the *Avantisundarīkathā* The similarity of diction between the second and fourth passages is particularly striking The *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* (VIII 94) while depicting Ambālikā, the princess referred to in the second passage from *Dasakumaracarita*, has the following शरदम्बुधरोत्सगशय्याम् इव शतह्रदाम् । तस्करस्यापि मे चेतस्तयैव मुषित तदा, displaying close resemblance to the passage from the romance

2 A deep loud voice of a man has often been compared to the rumbling of a cloud as in the following instances

(i) मदभ्राभ्रनिर्घोषगम्भीरेण स्वरेणाभ्यधात् (DKC p 61)

(ii) नवाम्बुवाहस्तनितगम्भीरेण स्वरेणानुगृहीत (DKC p 102)

(iii) अम्भोधरध्वानगम्भीराणि कण्ठगर्जितानि (ASK p 57)

(iv) उद्धुरध्वनिधाराधरोद्धुरितधाराधरध्वनिरभ्यधत्त (ASK p 74)

3 Darkness of night gets its standard of comparison from the dark spot on Śiva's neck in the following instances from the two works

(i) धूर्जटिकण्ठकल्माषकालतमे तमसि (DKC p 77)

(ii) गरगलश्यामशर्वरीचकार (DKC p 137)

(iii) नीलकण्ठकण्ठमेचकासु दिक्षु (ASK p 31)

4 Clear, bright waters of a lake find an echo in a fractured gem in both the works, in almost similar words Compare मणिभङ्गनिर्मलाम्भसि मणिकर्णिकायाम (DKC p 123) with हरिन्मणिभङ्गवर्णवारिणि सरसि (ASK p 222)

5 Both the works describe the waters of a lake as having got tinged red by the flashing rocks of a ruby (or jewelled) stairway Compare शोणीभूतम् उत्प्रभाभि पद्मरागसोपानशिलाभि (सर) (DKC p 156) and मणितटरश्मिजालसंदिग्धवारिभि सरोभि (ASK p 19)

6 Again, both the *kavyas* depict the lakes attended by the rows of cranes as having been ornamented with white lotuses, as in the following passages

(i) सारसश्रेणिशेखरस्य सरस (DKC p 178)

(ii) सरसि सारसावतंसे (ASK p 222)

(iii) सारसकलहंसावतंससरसविकटतटाकमण्डला (मगधा) (ASK p 18)

7 Both the works describe the water of a lake as having been marked by the spreading circles caused by the drops of honey from blue lotuses, an idea which is perhaps Daṇḍin's peculiarly own [1] The passages in question which display a close resemblance in diction also are

(i) इन्दीवरारविन्दमकरन्दबिन्दुचन्द्रकोत्तर गोत्रवारि (DKC p 156)

(ii) इन्द्रनीलकुवलयमकरन्दबिन्दुचन्द्रकिते बिन्दुसरसि (ASK p 189)

8 Another instance of fine imagery inviting our attention compares the white silk fibre to the moonlight The passages are

(i) उपयच्छचन्द्रातपच्छेदकल्पम्[2] शुक्लांशुकवितानम् ऐक्षिपि (DKC p 138)

(ii) चन्द्रातपमयम् इव नेत्रनिवेशाभिरामधवलम् अंशुकयुगलम् उदवहन् (राजहंस) (ASK p 63)

(iii) हंसतु(तू)लप्रचयसुकुमारचन्द्रातपधवलाम्बरतलविविक्तिनी (वसुमती) (ASK p 158)

(iv) चन्द्रिकासितांशुकपट भारमिवाससज (ASK p 158)

(v) क्षौमवत्या न लक्ष्यन्ते ज्योत्स्नायाम् अभिसारिका (KA ii 215)

9 The beautiful eyes have been realistically described

1 The phenomenon but not the specific idea occurs in literature cp Ragh XIV 38 also cp ASK p 221 (आज्यबिन्दुचन्द्रकिणीभि)

2 Cp ASK p 162 बालातपच्छेदम् इव तरलकणपारिजात किसलय मादायस्य (स्निग्ध) ।

as being dark and white and reddish at the corners in both the works Compare असितधवलरक्तत्रिभागभासुरमधुरधीरसञ्चारमन्थरायतेक्षणम् (DKC p 160) and रक्तनीलधवलकान्तिना प्रियतमेक्षणाग्रप्रभासञ्चयेन (ASK p 35)[1]

10 The string of side glances has been fancifully likened to a wreath of blue lotuses in the following instances from the two works

(i) नीलोत्पलमयम् इवापाङ्गदामाङ्गे मम मुञ्चन्ती (DKC p 74)

(ii) लीलाकटाक्षमालाशृङ्खलाभिर्नीलोत्पलपलाशदामश्यामलाभिर्माम् अबध्नात् (DKC p 84)

(iii) तद्दृष्टिविभ्रमोत्पलवनसत्त्रापाश्रय पञ्चशर (DKC pp 83-4)

(iv) कुवलयदामश्यामलाभिलक्ष्मीकटाक्षमालाभिरिव तरङ्गराजिभि (ASK p 14)

(v) विजृम्भमाणकुवलयसरस्सहस्रम् इव लीलापाङ्गलास्यैः (उत्सप प्रचक्रु) (ASK p 162)

(vi) रक्तकटाक्षमालाभि (ASK p 28)

(vii) प्रियतमेक्षणकुवलयस्रञ्जि (रतानि) (ASK p 26)

(viii) कामपालग्रथितलीलापाङ्गदृष्टि (ASK p 202)

11 A lady s bright cheeks (and once breasts) have been spoken of as reflecting the objects facing them, in both the works in almost similar phraseology The passages in question are

(i) गण्डस्थलीसङ्क्रान्तहस्तपल्लवादर्शितकर्णान्तसङ्करम् (DKC p 98)

(ii) उपरिकपोलादर्शतलनिपतितचित्रवितानपत्रजातिजनितविशेषकश्रियम् (DKC p 98)

(iii) कपोलसङ्क्रान्तचन्द्रश्चन्द्रोदय इव (ASK p 33)

(iv) कपोलादर्शसङ्क्रान्तरुधिरसिक्तचुरकुलकीर्णगन्धप्रकीर्णकनिकरशातितस्य कालरात्रिमुखस्य (ASK p 115)

(v) कुचकपोलसङ्क्रान्तदीपालोकतया शोकपावकम् इव हृदयम् अन्तर्मुखेनोद्गिरन्तीम् (मगधराजमहिषीम्) (ASK p 119)

(vi) कामयमानकामिनीकपोलादर्शा(व*)तारस्तारापति (ASK p 146)

---

1 Also cp KA II 339 कृष्णार्जुनानुरक्तापि दृष्टि The idea is frequently adopted in later literature

12 The god of love tormenting the lovers has been suitably conceived as a serpent, in the following instances

(i) अनङ्गपन्नगमुखशिखिशिखाभि (ASK p 28)

(ii) जीवय माम अनङ्गभुजगदष्टम (DKC p 115)[1]

13 Both the works concur in describing at a number of places a hero s attainment of royal fortune and of knowledge as his having been obliged with an embrace by the goddesses of fortune and learning respectively

At places, there are close resemblances in the two romances in the matter of phraseology and choice of diction A good number of phrases and idiomatic expressions many of which seem to be his own creation, are particularly favourite with the writer who employs them so often in his works Some such instances are

1 देव, दृष्टिदानेनानुगृह्यताम अयम आज्ञाकर (DKC p 63) The idea mostly in similar phraseology occurs in the following passages from the two works

(i) देव, दीयताम अनुग्रहाद चित्तम (DKC p 59)

(ii) क्षणम अवधानदानाद अनुगृहीततम क्रियताम अय जन (ASK p 9)[3]

(iii) इतो दृष्टिदानेनानुग्रह क्रियताम (ASK p 90)

(iv) सकृद अपि दृष्टिदानेनानुगृह्यताम अयम अनन्यशरणो जन (ASK p 237)

2 नाथकामो धमस्य शततमीम अपि कला स्पृशन (DKC p 70) The peculiar phrase *śatatamim api kalam* (even the hundredth part or one percent) appears in the *Avantisundarikathā* in the following sentence अग्रामवासिनो वनग्रामस्य यान्गायासस्पन्दस्तस्य शततमीम अपि कलाम अरण्यवासिनस्तपस्याम् अस्य परिवेदा (?) भवन्ति (p 151)

3 The expression *sudrsta* with $\sqrt{kr}$ also seems to have been peculiar to Dandin It appears in the following sentences from the two works

---

1 Also cp ASKS IV 187 कन्दर्पदष्ट ।

2 Cp ASK pp 8 10 47 57 131 DKC pp 55 55 also cp ASK pp 12 154

3 Cp ASKS VII 58 दवान्नुग्रहत्ववधानदानात् ।

(i) अतोऽनया सुदृष्ट कारयित्वा त्यक्ष्यामि प्राणान (DKC p 150)

(ii) तेन सुदृष्टा मा कुरु (DKC p 164)

(iii) सुदृष्टश्च क्रियता जनोऽयम (ASK p 51)

4 The word *vibhāvarī* (night) has been used as a subject governed by $\sqrt{}$*bhā* or *vi* $\sqrt{}$*bha* in the peculiar sense 'the morning has dawned', in the following instances

(i) विभावरी च व्यभासीत (DKC p 141)

(ii) तावच्च सा विभाव (री*) बभौ (ASK p 135)[1]

(iii) विभाताऽच्याचारानुबन्धियविद्याविभावरी (ASK p 155)

(iv) जाग्रतोरेव नौ विभाता सा विभावरी (ASK p 240)

5 The peculiar phrase *kim ghaṭate* ? or *kva ghaṭate* ? ('Does it happen ?' 'Is it possible ?) appears in both the works in the following passages

(i) ससारदोषदर्शनात समाधिम् आस्थाय मुमुक्षमाणो मादृशो जन कुलवधूना शीलपातने घटत इति क्व घटते ? (DKC p 168)

(ii) मन्यया हसो बालम् प्रवगृह्य गच्छतीति किं घटते ? (ASK p 124)

6 The expression *ahīnakālam* ('without loss of time, 'forthwith') unnoticed by MW finds a place in both the works

(i) आसीच्च मम समीहितानाम् अहीनकालसिद्धि (DKC p 148)

(ii) तदयम् अहीनकाल निवर्त्य (ASK p 240)[2]

Some other passages with phraseological resemblance from the two works are given below

1 (i) यदि माम् अनुग्राह्यपक्षे गणयति देव (DKC p 146)

(ii) तावयम् अनुग्राह्यपक्ष देवस्य (ASK p 220)

(iii) अप्रष्टव्यपक्षे तमेव मुनिम् प्रतिष्ठिपत (ASK p 180)

2 (i) तदपि कियत्यापि धमकलया मा समग्रयेत् (DKC p 111)

(ii) पान(?) कयाचिद् अनुग्रहकलया योजयत (ASK p 126)

3 (i) इति वाच समभवन् (DKC p 61)

(ii) इति बभूवुरुच्चावचा प्रलापा (ASK p 61)

---

1 Cp ASKS (III 10) which has in this very context इत्यादि वदतामेव प्रभाता च विभावरी ।

2 The expression occurs in Pādat 41 f Mālav (V 15 f) has *akālahīna* in this sense

Strikingly close resemblance of diction is observed in the following instances

1 (i) पुरीतल्लतापरीतदन्तकाण्ड (हस्ती) (DKC p 81)

(ii) वद्दपुरीतत्परीतदन्तकाटि (वन्यकुञ्जर) (ASK p 192)

2 (i) (मत्तहस्ती) मण्डलितहस्तकाण्ड समभ्यधावत (DKC p 124)

(ii) वन्यकुञ्जर कोऽपि कुण्डलितहस्तकाण्डोऽभिपत्य प्रहृत्य (ASK p 192) (This passage is an improvement upon that of DKC)

3 (i) पारतल्पिकम उपधियुक्तम अपि दुष्टामित्रप्रमापणाभ्यु पायतया राज्योपलब्धिमूलतया च पुष्कलावयकामावप्यरीरघत (DKC p 122)

(ii) अतश्च प्रीतिम्त्तमा वैरनिर्यातनाच्च धर्मार्थौ च पुष्कलौ स्वाम्यर्थसाधनाद भवतम अभ्यावर्तेरन (ASK p 239)

4 (i) निरलक्तकरक्षपाटलेन दन्तच्छदेन (DKC p 141)

(ii) अपास्तालक्तक दशनच्छदकिसलयं (ASK p 27)

5 (i) मदुपभुक्तमुक्त रत्नतल्प (DKC p 110)

(ii) तदुपभुक्तमुक्तम उपवनम (ASK p 188)

6 (i) अकुरितघर्मसलिलदूषितकपोलपत्रभङ्ग (DKC p 153)

(ii) अविरलघर्मवारिविपदूषितविशेषकन्यास (ASK p 36)

7 (i) माधुर्यप्रकर्षावर्जितरसनेन्द्रियस्तद अच्छ पानीयम् (DKC p 163)

(ii) आवर्जितरसनेन्द्रिय वर्णकम (ASK p 222)

8 (i) आगमदीपदृष्टेन खल्वध्वना सुखेन वर्तते लोकयात्रा (DKC p 189)

(ii) आगमानुसारप्रवृत्ता च बुद्धिरनुगच्छति सर्वत्रैवावकाशम (ASK p 38)

9 (i) सतारप्यायतविशालयार्लोचनयो (DKC p 189)

(ii) धवलायतविशालम अक्षियुगलम (ASK p 124)

10 (i) शकुनानि चाशुभानि, शान्तये क्रियन्ताम (DKC p 193)

(ii) दुर्निमित्तागमनदृष्टानर्थ शान्तये क्रियन्ताम (ASK p 60)

11 (i) ब्रह्मकल्पा इम ब्राह्मणा (DKC p 193)

(ii) ब्रह्मकल्पैर्ब्रह्मभि (ASK p 98)

12 (i) अथ प्रथमगर्भाभिनन्दिना ता च प्रियगर्वा वसुमतीं दिदृक्षु प्रियवदा सह भर्त्रा पुष्पपुरम अगमत । तस्मिन्नेव च समये मालवेन मगधराजस्य

महज्जयम् अजनि (DKC p 103)

(ii) आपन्नसत्त्वा च ता सतीस्नेहा॰ दिदृक्षुर्देवी प्रियवदा भर्त्रा सह मगधान् प्रयासीत । अस्मिन्नेव चान्तरे मानसारेण नाम राजा मालवेन देवस्य मगधराजस्य प्रतिमहत् जयम् अजनि (ASK pp 171-2)

13 (i) नैरोग्यं चिरप्रणष्टप्रतिसंधानपूर्वस्य प्राणलाभस्य (DKC p 82)

(ii) (lacuna) नष्टप्रवृत्तस्यास्य यम इव प्रतिसंधानम् (ASK p 226) (Similarity of idea is to be especially noted)

Besides the peculiar expressions in the form of idioms and phrases noticed above there are a number of single vocables which appear from their frequent occurrence in the two works to be the writer's special choice The words are, or at least some of them, rarely used in literature while in these two romances they are conspicuous by their constant appearance The following are some of them

1 *andakapala* (lit skull of the universal egg) used in the figurative sense of 'hemisphere of the world', in the following instance

(i) कुत इदम ऊर्ध्वाण्डकपालसम्पुटोदरात्कॄलेऽसि सौधम आगतम् ? (DKC p 139)

(ii) रुधिरस्रोतोभिः पूरयन्तम इवाण्डकपालोदरम् (श्रीगभम्) (ASK p 113)

(iii) आयसाण्डकपालसम्पुटम इव (?) (ASK p 134)

It is significant to note that the word which is rather very rare in literature is followed by the same word viz, *samputa* or *udara* or by both, in the above passages, MW does not notice the word

2 *āgati* (<*ā*√*gam*) in its rather unusual, contracted sense of origin' or 'source in the following sentences

(i) नियतम् अस्मि तदागतिस्त्वेनाहम् मपदेश्य (DKC p 88)

(ii) नियतम् आगतिरपदेश्यव चास्तिस्य त्वयि (DKC p 88)

(iii) प्रातश्च तदागतिं नृपायाचष्ट (ASK p 182)

The meaning of the word is noticed by MW in *Daśakumā racarita* only

3 *ajati* (<*ā*√*jan*) in its rare sense of a descendant or son in the extracts given below

(i) तदनन्तरम अनन्तवर्मा नाम तदायतिरवनिम अध्यतिष्ठत् (DKC p 188)

(ii) तदायनि(ति)रात्मनेजोवघृतशुद्ध्या शुश्रु (ASK p 147)

MW notices this meaning in *Daśakumaracarita* only The word seems to have taken this peculiar significance from the meaning future attributed to it in the compound *tadatvāyati* (present and future) a term frequently used by the writers on polity and noticed also by Dandin [1]

4 *udirna* ($<ut\sqrt{ir}$) (awakened, increased or elevated) used frequently to qualify mostly abstract nouns as in the following instances

(i) उदीर्णरागवृत्ति (DKC p 70)

(ii) उदीर्णवैराग्य (DKC p 75)

(iii) उदीर्णमि अभ्युदस्य रणरणिकाम (ASK p 51)

(iv) उदीर्णरणाष्मधूम (ASK p 113)

(v) उदीर्णपुरपद्रोह (ASK p 188)

(vi) उदीर्णोत्कलिका (ASK p 191)

(vii) उदीर्णो रागसागर (KA II 257)

5 *upodha* (*upa* $\sqrt{}$*vah*) in the sense of 'intense' or 'increased' qualifying mostly abstract nouns (DKC pp 62, 89 129, 171 ASK p 35 KA III 52)

6 *gupti* ($<\sqrt{}$*gup*) in the contracted sense of 'fortification' or rampart (DKC p 134 ASK p 70)

7 *goruta* ($<$*go* + *ruta*$<\sqrt{}$*ru*) (lit as far as a cows lowing can be heard) as a measure of distance (probably 2000 dandas) (DKC p 147 ASK p 76) MW notices this word in *Daśakumaracarita* only

8 *citriya* ($<\sqrt{}$*citriya* $<$*citra*) occurs in the sense of admiration or surprise as in the following instances

(i) चित्रीयाविष्टचित्तश्चाचिन्तयम् (DKC p 151)[2]

(ii) चित्रीयावलारूतचित्तसगन (ASK p 16)

MW notices the word in *Dasakumaracarita* only The

---

1 KNit V 6 Manu VII 178 Kaut V 1 57 4 6 VII 6 37 IX 7 52 DKC p 56 also cp Kir I 15 II 43 also cp Amara

2 Also cp ASKS VI 86 दृष्ट्वा पुष्पोद्भवे पित्र चित्रीयाविष्टचेतसि ।

denominative verb √*citrīya* is also conspicuous by its frequent occurrence, both as a verbal form and a participle, in Dandin [1]

9 *tiras* with √*kr* in the rather unusual or figurative sense of 'to disguise' (DKC p 207, ASK p 19)

10 *dyumna* in the rare and very old meaning of 'wealth or possession' noticed in the *Nighanṭu*[2] (DKC p 75, ASK p 191) MW notices this meaning of the word in *Daśakumāracarita* only

11 *nāma* in its rather unusual sense of 'quasi-', or only in appearance, as in the following instances

(i) सर्वपतिगृह्यो नाम भूत्वा (DKC p 86)

(ii) मोर (सर्पेण) यदृच्छया पतितेन नाम दशयित्वा (DKC p 130)

(iii) सह च भीतो नामावप्लुत्य (DKC p 132)

(iv) परिवर्तितस्त्रीवेषस्ते कन्या नाम भवेयम् (DKC p 146)

(v) वार्तान्तिको नाम भूत्वा (DKC p 159)

(vi) क्रीडामत्ता नाम कन्दुकं भ्रामयेयम् (DKC p 165)

(vii) भार्गवो नाम भूत्वा (DKC p 167)

(viii) प्रणयकुपिता नाम भूत्वा (DKC p 168)

(ix) विनिर्वासितो नाम भूत्वा (DKC p 196)

(x) यादृच्छिकीर्नाम तच्चरणमूलपट्टे स्पर्शातिशयानुगमप्रार्थना प्रणिपात (ASK p 28)

(xi) कन्या नाम भूत्वा सवर्णीरप्रत्ययम् अग्रहीषम् (ASK p 187)

(xii) स यथोक्तकारी नाम तत्र गत्वा प्रत्यागच्छत् (ASK p 240)

(xiii) प्रदर्श्य च तस्मै प्रतिसंहृतो नाम भूत्वा (ASK p 187)

12 *paribarha* (<*pari*√*brmh*) in the rare and rather more comprehensive sense of 'train of attendants' (DKC pp 66, 72, 135, ASK p 132) Once, however in the *Avantisundarīkathā*, it occurs in the sense of 'paraphernalia', in which sense Amara notices it and Kālidāsa has it [3]

13 *peśala* (<*peśa*<√*piś* 'to adorn') in the sense of 'beautiful or charming' (DKC pp 85, 97, 115, 130 153, 205

1 Cp DKC pp 107 184 ASK pp 3 47 64 165 ASKS VI 132
2 II 10
3 Cp ASK p 176 Ragh XIV 15

ASK pp 18 34 55 223 232, 233)[1] It may be remarked that in almost all occurrences the word, used either as an adjective or an adverb expresses the meaning 'beautiful, 'nice' or 'charming or beautifully and nicely', a sense generally not noticed in other writers Kalidasa for instance uses the word in the sense of soft or delicate in a number of places

14 *praptarupa* in the sense of 'fit or proper' (DKC pp 80 96 99 136 ASK pp 59, 78) Once *Avantisundarikathā* (p 123) has *yogyarupa* It is one of the rare usages favourite with Dandin MW notices it in this sense in *Daśakumāra carita* only

15 *mrja* (<√ *mrj*) cleansing or purity (DKC pp 159, 161 ASK pp 113 158 202) The word occurs very rarely in literature

16 *sara* speckled' motley (DKC pp 55, 65, 178 ASK pp 96 141)

17 *siphara* in the sense of 'charming or 'delightful (DKC p 55 ASK p 18) The word which is rather rare in literature occurs in some *bhanas* The lexicographer Ajaya notices the word with its two meanings referred to above

18 *syava* darkened (DKC p 79, ASK p 198) It is *comparatively an older word used mainly in Vedic literature*

19 *sphuta* in the sense of heavy or abundant (DKC pp 66 121 157 ASK pp 14 51, 63 232) Similarity in the usage between the following two passages is to be especially noted

(i) प्रवत्तस्फीतसविपि हिरण्यरेतसि (DKC p 121)

(ii) पीन (?, प्रवत्त ?) स्फीतसविपि (ASK p 51)

Again the two romances use certain verbs in their peculiar or secondary significance which in some cases is very rarely noticed in the literature outside Daṇḍin Some of such verbs which display a close affinity in their use in the two works are noted below

1 √*kram* with *upa* to cure (DKC pp 79, 96 104

---

1 Also cp KA II 275 ASKS I 44

2 Cp Megh 90 Ragh IX 40 XI 45 XIII 34 =agreeable Mālav III =clever Uttar VI 34 Hear p 17

ASK pp 138, 203 ASKS VIII 51, in DKC p 148, however it occurs in the sense 'to accomplish') MW notices the meaning in *Dasakumāracarita* and *Suśruta*

2 √*gal* 'to pass', governing the nouns denoting time, as in the following instances

(i) गलति च निशीथे (DKC p 172)

(ii) निशि गलदर्धायाम् (DKC p 181)

(iii) गलति मध्यरात्रे (DKC p 207)

(iv) गलितो ह्दितकाल (ASK p 132)

3 √*dru* (lit =to flow, to melt) with or without a preposition in its secondary significance 'to run or to run away (DKC pp 124, 132, 206 ASK pp 12, 19 77)

4 √*langh* (lit =to cross) with or often without preposition in its secondary significance to injure, 'to surpass' or to overpower' The verb seems to have been favourite with Daṇḍin (Cp DKC pp 175 176 177, 179 185 ASK pp 6 36 112, KA I 44, II 224 III 90, 142 cp also Śak VII 14 f)

5 √*lih* (to lick) in its secondary significance to shut' 'to strike', 'to destroy' or 'to supersede (DKC pp 103, 145, 172 177, 205 ASK pp 3, 12 104, KA III 127)

6 √*sphur* in the peculiar sense of 'to awaken to flash *or 'to be manifest' with abstract nouns such as love wonder* etc (DKC pp 55 73 98 ASK pp 5, 57 71-2 113, 127 173)

The root has also been used in the sense to tremble, to convulse or to flash' in a number of places (DKC pp 102 136 171 ASK pp 5, 51, 55, 100, 146 173, 202) [1]

7 √*han* with *pra* in comparatively rare sense 'to tread freely (a path), as in the following instances

(i) प्रहतास्च पातकपथा (DKC p 198)

(ii) प्रहतेषु कापथेषु (ASK p 12)

(iii) प्रबुद्धजनप्रहत एष पन्था (ASK p 50)

The striking points of resemblance with special reference

---

1 Cp ASKS IV 209 स्फुरितानि कानि का न्यभिलाषरसात्हृता कुरुत (identical with ASK passage at p 202)

to the imagery and diction between the two works would have been brought into fuller relief if the earlier part of the *Avantisundarikatha* had been preserved to us for we could compare then with better results the two works, and see how they went on with the same course of narrative with similar incidents It has been suggested earlier that the writer chose to elaborate in deference to the literary tendencies of the age the story of his earlier romance *Dasakumāracarita*, in his later work Although we cannot say with definiteness, in the paucity of evidence up to what stage or point Dandin was able to elaborate the story of his earlier writing in his *Avantisundari katha* it may be reasonably presumed that he did work upon the larger part of the narrative What we possess today of the *Avantisundarikatha* does not touch (or rather it is far behind) the point of the story where the authentic *Dasakumaracarita* of Dandin begins after the spurious *Purvapiṭhika*, so that we are not able to determine the precise relationship the story of *Dasakumaracarita* had with its counterpart in the *Avantisundari katha* in the matter of treatment of the narrative and the employment of diction It is a curious coincidence that the portion of the narrative extant in the *Avantisundarikatha* is represented in the *Dasakumaracarita* by the *Purvapiṭhikā* which is evidently a patchwork of much later date and the part of the story which we possess in *Dasakumaracarita* resumes the story at a point much later than that where the available portion of the *Avantisundarikatha* breaks off The latter romance reaches the point of the story where the prince Rajavahana enters the chasm along with Matanga to help him win his beloved Mandakinī leaving behind his companions in sleep in the jungle while the authentic *Dasakumaracarita* opens with Rajavahana and Avantisundari enjoying life after their wedlock magically effected by the conjuror Vidyesvara

The curious phenomenon has led some scholars to think that the extant portion of the *Avantisundarikatha* is the lost and now recovered prelude to the work *Avantisundarikatha* which, according to them received the designation *Daśakumaracarita* later when its earlier part was lost We shall refer to this aspect of the question in detail later on

The gap between the thread of the narrative (Rājavāhana s coming back to the place where he left his friends, his visit to Ujjayini where he comes across Puspodbhava and later Somadatta, and his marriage with the princess Avantisundari) is furnished by the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* and the *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* While the *Pīṭhikā* is a patchwork and is a late addition to the text and presents discrepancies with regard to the detail of events the *Kathāsāra* is happily a faithful summary of the *Avantisundarīkathā* and as such represents the original narrative in its correct, though abridged form

The evidence of the *Kathāsāra* is of vital importance to us, for it carries the tale of the *Avantisundarīkathā* much farther than the original work recovered in incomplete form Not only does it reach the point of the story where the authentic *Daśakumāracarita* begins, but also takes the tale as far as the middle of the story of Upahāravarman where he proceeds with his plan to seduce Kalpasundari, as we find it in the *Daśakumāracarita* (up to page 108)

As the *Kathāsāra* is a faithful summary of the *Avantisundarīkathā* and often indents upon the words and phrases of the original,[1] it may safely be taken to represent the original in the matter both of the course of narrative and of diction

An examination of the parallel passages indicates the general tendency of the summariser to leave out the details that are not needed in the compendium and to change the words and phrases generally for the exigencies of metre only Besides closely following the diction of the original the *Kathāsāra* also quotes the verses occurring sporadically in the text, *verbatim*[2]

What we mean to emphasise is that the *Kathāsāra* represents the original in respect not only of the matter but also of the diction And once it has been established, we may proceed with our next job to examine the diction of the writer

---

1 For passages showing affinity between the two see App IV

2 Cp ASK p 9 (*danujapati* etc) in ASKS I 16 ASK p 202 (*mugdha* etc) in ASKS IV 209 and ASK p 223 (*saptacchada* etc) in ASKS V 38 Another *āryā* verse *yadi abhilaṣasi* etc cited in ASKS (IV 212) is evidently lost in ASK (p 202 or 203)

in the *Dasakumaracarita* and the *Avantisundarikatha* (as represented by its summary) dealing with the same situations and describing the same incidents From a comparative study of the two we know that the later part of the story of Rājavahana the whole account of Apahāravarman and the earlier part of the story of Upaharavarman concur in both the works namely, *Dasakumaracarita* (pp 54 - 108) and the *Avantisundarikathā* as represented by its summary (VII 79 to VIII 125)

Now a close examination of the relevant part of the *Dasakumaracarita* and the corresponding portion of the summary of the *Avantisundarikatha* reveals striking points of affinity between the two in point not only of matter but also of diction a considerable number of idioms and phrases, evidently peculiar to Dandin s diction, occurring in almost identical form in both of them These points of similarity, which may not be dismissed as being merely accidental, can be explained only when we presume that the *Kathasāra* retained while summarising the story a large number of idioms and phrases of the original constituting the writer s diction in the *Avantisundarikatha* which in turn must be presumed to have borne intimate affinity to the *Dasakumaracarita*

The point of affinity which strikes us the most appertains to the description of the duties and functions of a courtesan s mother in grooming her daughter right from her childhood and one cannot fail to discern herein the common mind at work Again the citation of the following verse from the *Avantisundarikatha* (lost portion) in the *Kathasara* (which cites *verbatim* the sporadic verses of the original as we have seen above) is significant

त्वाम प्रथम प्रावद्धान्जलि दासजनस्तम इमम् प्रथम प्रयपने ।
त्वयिहि मया सह सुरतव्यतिकरसि नैवम एव त्वम ।।[1]

The fact that the verse occurs in the same context in the *Daśakumaracarita* (at page 99 which does not get representation in the extant *Avantisundarikatha* but is happily represented in the verse summary) though with a slightly different reading[2]

1 ASKS VIII 98
2 DKC p 99 has ०स्यिन्नैव मा मैवम् ।

should prove beyond doubt that the stanza originally occurred *in both the works, and that the same writer was responsible* for its occurrence in the two There is also close resemblance in the story of the successive births of Kāmapāla outlined in the *Daśakumāracarita* (page 127) and elaborated in the *Avantisundarīkathā* The latter romance has lost the portion (somewhere at p 200 where five folios are missing) which however, luckily survives in its summary (IV 161 ff) The summary introduces the tale in the following words कीदृशस्ते शिशावस्मिन् भाव इत्यहम् अप्रवम्। औरसे यादृग् इत्युक्ते तन्मूल प्रभुरभ्यधात The *Daśakumāracarita* (p 127) has the following 'वाले, बालेऽस्मिन् कीदृशस्ते भाव ?' इति। 'औरस इवास्मिन् वत्से वत्सलता' इति मया विज्ञापित 'सत्यम् आह वराकी' इति तन्मूलाम् अतिमहती कथाम् अकरोत् The close resemblance of diction here could not be without significance

Thus the lost portion of *Avantisundarīkathā*, and for that reason the extant portion also bore close affinity to the *Daśakumāracarita*, the earlier attempt of the writer as far as the employment of diction and idiom was concerned, though of course, *it might have contained a large amount of additional* matter in the form of lengthy descriptions and episodic tales

The natural conclusion that can be drawn from the foregoing discussion is that Daṇḍin elaborated his earlier romance in his later life in the form of *Avantisundarīkatha* in deference to the literary tendencies of the age In the process, he could *not help adopting, consciously or otherwise, a large number of* idioms and phrases mostly peculiar to his diction And this intimate resemblance of diction in the two works should safely be taken to confirm the theory of the common authorship of the two romances which even otherwise are known though individually or separately to be the works of Daṇḍin This may not, however, be *taken to prove that the two works originally* formed parts of one and the same work, the extant *Avantisundarīkathā* being the earlier portion and the *Daśakumāracarita* the middle one with an epilogue not recovered as yet The question which calls for a fuller discussion will be dealt with later

The other link which connects the two romances relates to the employment of literary feats of similar nature Both the

works indulge in the difficult *tour de forces* the like of which is generally unnoticed in Sanskrit literature While the *Daśa kumāracarita* attemps at accomplishing the difficult feat of total avoidance of labial letters in one whole chapter (VII), the *Avantisundarikatha* makes one of its heroes, Somadatta to relate his tale in twenty four soft letters only as is evidenced by its summary in verse [1] It is possible that the lost portions of the *Dasakumāracarita* and *Avantisundarikatha* also employed these literary feats in their stories of Somadatta and Mantragupta respectively It may be noted that the *Kavyadarsa* notices and describes the literary feats of this type, while dealing with the *citraduskaramargas* in poetry

Again the two romances display unity on an important point inasmuch as both of them do not comply strictly with the rules either of an *akhyayika* or of a *kathā* and this disregard of convention in practice is in full consonance with the dictum of the *Kavyadarśa* which rejects the fine distinctions between the two forms [3] We cannot agree therefore with Dr S K De who opines that the fact that *Avantisundarikatha*, which is called a *katha* really conforms to the requirements of an *akhyayikā* shows that its author has apparently confused the characteristics of the two forms [4] for in fact, while it does not fulfil the conditions of an *akhyayika* in all details as suggested by De it does indeed blend the features of the two species of prose *kavya* in its form And it is by no means the result of confusion, it has been effected deliberately and it reflects the author's clear view in this regard as indicated by the *Kavyādarśa*

The theory gets additional support from the fact that both the romances supply us to a great extent, with common geographical data and reflect almost identical political and social conditions and cultural atmosphere It may be added that as the *Daśakumaracarita* chiefly concentrates upon the narrative and seldom digresses into descriptions of varied nature,

---

1 ASKS VII 14-48 see below pt III ch IV
2 KA III 83 92-5 see below pt II ch VII
3 KA I 28 see below pt II ch II
4 IHQ I p 31 III pp 402-3

it is naturally not as rich in cultural data as the other romance which by its very nature reflects, chiefly through its elaborate descriptive material, the society and culture of the time far more abundantly and in far greater details It should not surprise us, therefore, if we do not come across the details regarding geographical, political, social and economic conditions in the earlier romance in their fullness and variety Nor should the fact lead us to think that the social and cultural environ ments reflected in the two works are at variance In fact, there is complete identity between the two romances as far as the outline of society and culture portrayed in them is concerned, and it is only in point of the elaboration of details that they naturally differ

One of the arguments given against the theory of common authorship refers to the supposed gap in time between the composition of the two romances It is argued that while the *Avantisundarīkathā* reflects the literary tendencies of the post-Bāna period, representing as it does the artificial diction of the later age of decadence, the other romance must have preceded the works of Bāna and even that of Subandhu It may be urged, however, that it is not safe to base the dating of a particular work exclusively on its style, for there can be factors other than the general tendencies of the age which may have an impact on the style of a work In the present case, we should better attribute the simpler style and diction of the *Daśakumāra carita* to its writer's genuine spirit to revolutionise the literary norm of the time and also to his realistic outlook on life and people, rather than connect it with the supposed period of simplicity of diction As we shall see in a subsequent chapter, the time assigned to the *Avantisundarīkatha* on the basis of internal evidence, *viz* the close of 7th century A D and the beginning of the 8th, suits well the *Daśakumāracarita* also

The theory of common authorship of the two romances, therefore, should be regarded as established, unless, however, some positive evidence against it comes forth by further discovery or research

CHAPTER II

WORKS OF DANDIN

Rājaśekhara in a verse attributes the composition of three works (*prabandhas*) to Dandin [1] and taking the *Kavyadarśa* and *Daśakumaracarita* to be the two works of his,[2] scholars have made various conjectures about his third book Pischel suggested the *Mṛcchakaṭika* as the third requisite book on the ground that it contains the verse *limpativa* etc (occurring in the *Kavyadarśa*)[3] which, according to him, is ascribed to Daṇḍin by Pratihārendurāja,[4] and that the society depicted in the play closely resembles that described in the *Daśakumaracarita* [5] Pischel s curious argument will land us as S K De remarks rightly in the absurdity of identifying Daṇḍin with Bhāsa as

---

1 Cp Śarṅg 174 and Sukti IV 74 त्रयोऽग्नयस्त्रयो वेदास्त्रयो देवास्त्रयो गुणा । त्रयो दण्डिप्रबन्धाश्च त्रिषु लोकेषु विश्रुता ॥, ascribed to Rājaśekhara also quoted in ŚPr (Josyer ed II p 328)

2 Some scholars do not include even these works in the trio Acc to Agashe while DKC is not a work of the old Daṇḍin referred to by Rājaśekhara KA is not a *prabandha* (literary composition) Thus in his view all the three *prabandhas* of Daṇḍin have been lost cp Agashe *op cit* pp li lvi lxvii f cp below also

3 Mṛcch I 34 लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभः । असत्पुरुषसेवेव दृष्टिर्विफलतां गता ॥ cp KA II 362 also 226 (first line only) Acc to De (HSP I p 60) the reading in full (II 362) on which apparently Pischel s theory was based, is doubtful the verse is absent in the Tibetan version of the text (JRAS 1903) as well as in Rangacharya ed This seems however to be the result of an error of omission because the context requires the verse

4 Cp comm. *Laghuvṛtti* on Udbhaṭa s KASS p 26 As pointed out by De (HSP I p 60) Pischel is not accurate in stating that Pratīhārendurāja attributes the verse to Daṇḍin While discussing *utprekṣā* he simply says that Daṇḍin has already discussed at great length that the verse *limpatīva* etc. is an illustration of *utprekṣā*

5 *Die orientalischen Literaturen* p 206

well, inasmuch as the same verse occurs in the Bhāsa plays also[1] Moreover the fact that the same verse has been attributed to Bhartṛmeṇṭha and Vikramāditya by Śārṅgadhara and Vallabhadeva,[2] further nullifies the argument of Pischel In fact, Daṇḍin borrowed well-known verses from various sources for illustration and discussion as he himself admits in a general way,[3] and the verse in question is undoubtedly a citation, as his elaborate discussion on it with the introductory words *itidam api*[4] unmistakably shows As regards the second reason adduced by Pischel for attributing the *Mṛcchakaṭika* to Daṇḍin it may be remarked that it is most unsafe to ascribe any two works to one author on the basis of the similarity of the state of society reflected therein Indeed, Pischel s theory which received little support from scholars, has been discarded now[5]

Chandoviciti, referred to in the *Kāvyadarśa*, was suggested by Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa and Jacobi to be an independent lost work composed by Daṇḍin[6] Peterson partially supported the theory on the ground that Daṇḍin has clearly referred to a book here (I 12) and that, too, of his own composition and this fact, according to him accounts for his omitting from his work the subject of metre He, however being disinclined to recognise in it the third pillar of his fame regarded it as a mere appendix to his *Kāvyādarśa*[7] Keith also granted the possibility of *Chandoviciti* being a supplement to be appended to the *Kāvyādarśa*[8] Neither of these views is tenable, because the word *chandoviciti* has been mentioned here, as also elsewhere

---

1 See Bālac. I 15 and Cāru I 19 cp De HSP I p 60

2 Śārṅg No 3603, *Subhāṣitāvali* No 1890

3 Cp KA I 2 प्रयोगानुपलभ्य च, for verses cited from others see App VI

4 See KA II 226-34 cp below also

5 The theory has amply been refuted by Peterson (Agashe s ed of DKC pp xi xii) Kale (DKC intro p xxiii), Keith (HSL p 296 CSL p 67) De (HSP I p 60) S L Katre (IHQ XXIV pp 112 3) etc

6 Cp KA I 12 cp Premacandra thereon Jacobi *Indische Studien* xvii p 447

7 Cp DKC (Agashe ed.) intro pp ix xi

8 Cp HSL p 296

in Sanskrit literature, in the sense of metrical science in general[1] In the *Kāvyadarsa*, the word *vidya* (science) employed to denote it in the second line of the verse in question, also unmistakably points to its being a general term meaning the science of metre At the most, it may denote the science as expounded by Pingala in his *Chandahsutra*[2] There is no justification, there fore, for regarding Dandin s allusion here as to a work of that name of his own composition[3]

A suggestion was made that *Kalapariccheda*, referred to in *Kavyadarsa* might be the third work of Dandin[4] As a matter of fact, however it was not an independent book, but a chapter on arts (*kalās*) in the *Kavyadarsa*, as the term *pariccheda* (section or chapter) suffixed thereto shows It may be noted that the term is found applied to the extant chapters of the work itself The enjoining phrase *rupam āvirbhavisyati* which has been employed at two other places with a view to introducing an illustration,[5] obviously refers here to the topic on arts discussed subsequently in the work itself A chapter on arts, including drama and music, does not appear to be improbable in a work of rhetoric[6] and in the present case, the chapter on *kalas*, the fourth in the *Kavyadarśa* actually existed at one time Jagad dhara in his commentary on *Malatimadhava* cites six passages

---

1 The word occurs in earlier works like Āp Dh S (II 4 8 11) Pān (IV 3 73 *Rgavana gana*) and Kauṭ (I 3 3) as one of the six *Vedāngas* it is also found mentioned in Varāhamihira s BS (CIV, 64) Vāmana s KASV (I 3 3 6) Bhoja s ŚPr (XI Josyer ed II p 474) Rājaśekhara s KMim II (pp 5 7) X (p 129) and in Kedarabhaṭṭa s *Vṛttaratnākara* (vi 3) as a science of metre

2 The comm Hṛd. on KA (I 12) regards *Chandoviciti* as a work written by Pingalanāga In Vās where the word occurs thrice (pp 73 95 207) the reference seems to be to BNS XIV XV (KM ed) dealing with metres and styled as *chandoviciti* cp S L Katre IHQ XXIV p 115

3 Cp also Agashe *op cit* p lxvi Kale DKC intro p xxiii K S Mahadeva Sastri ASK intro pp 7 8 Kane HSP pp 92-4 S L. Katre IHQ XXIV pp 114-5

4 Cp KA III 171 तस्या कलापरिच्छेदे रूपम् माविर्भविष्यति ।

5 Cp KA II 265 315

6. Cp Agashe *op cit* p lxvi

under Daṇḍin's name [1] Of these, only three are directly traceable in the extant *Kāvyādarśa*,[2] while two other citations can be, with plausibility, accommodated somewhere in the present chapters of the work [3] One citation, however, which concerns the treatment of the *prakarana* type of drama,[4] cannot be incorporated anywhere in the available text To justify this citation, we shall have to assume that Daṇḍin also wrote an additional treatise either as an independent work, or more plausibly, as a section, now lost, of the *Kāvyadarsa* itself, wherein he dealt with drama as one of the sixty four arts The term *kalāpariccheda* denotes a section exactly with such a scope [5] Again, there are two passages cited in *Jayamangalā*, a commentary by Yaśodhara on Vatsyāyana's *Kamasūtra* as from *Kāvyādarśa*,[6] which are not found in the extant text These passages are related with two of the sixty four arts which the *kalāpariccheda* dealt with These instances show that when Jagaddhara (c between 1300–1400 A D) and Yaśodhara (c 1250) wrote their commentaries,[7] there was a section in the *Kavyādarśa* on sixty four arts, which later became extinct Tradition also seems to support this view [8] When Daṇḍin said in the *Kavyadarśa* that the *nāṭaka* etc will be dealt with elsewhere, he referred most probably to this chapter and not to the *Nāṭyaśastra* of Bharata [9] But the *kalapariccheda*, though composed by Daṇḍin, could not have

---

1 Cp comm on Mālat I 10 I 11 IX 10 I 1 I 10 and I 18 f, cp S L Katre IHQ XXIV pp 118 22 cp App VIII V Raghavan (ŚPr p 839) however, doubts the correctness of these quotations except the one on the *guna udāratva*

2 Cp comm. on I 10 in KA I 76 I 11 in KA II 234 and IX 10 in KA II 51

3 Cp App VIII

4 Cp comm on I 18 f also see App VIII

5 Cp KA III 171 for 64 arts see Kām I 3 16 also cp CSD ch VII

6 Cp comm. on Kām. I 3 16 (the arts *durvacakayoga* and *kāvyasamasyā purana*)

7 Cp (a) P K Gode JUB IX pt II pp 116-25, (b) Keith HSL p 469

8 Cp Ratna and Taruṇa on KA III 171

9 Cp KA I 31, cp S L Katre IHQ XXIV pp 120 ff

been meant to be the third requisite work of Danḍin, because it was a *pariccheda* and not an independent work

There are two books more which had been wrongly put in the name of Danḍin Of them, the drama *Mallikāmāruta*, ascribed to Dandin on the basis of numerous points of similarity, has been shown beyond doubt to be the work of one Uddanḍin or Uddandanatha of the middle of 17th century A D ,[1] while the suggestion of Harichand that *Anamayastotra* was the third work of Dandin has been rightly dismissed by A B Keith as not worthy of consideration

All the above speculations regarding the third work of Dandin have arisen on account of the needless stress put on the statement of Rajaśekhara which, to add to the confusion has been misconstrued also A certain work should be attributed to an author only on a solid ground To ascribe a work to a particular writer on slender grounds in order to fill the number of the books the author has been credited with is most unsafe and is likely to lead to wrong results as we see in the present case We should discuss therefore the works which have been traditionally ascribed to Danḍin on their own merit and then if possible try to construe the statement of Rājaśekhara in the new light

There is complete unanimity with regard to the *Kāvyadarsa* also styled as *Kavyalaksana*[2] being a work of Dandin, or *Ācarya* Danḍin as the colophon of the work reads The work has been frequently referred to as Danḍin's in literature right from the end of 7th century A D (his own time)[4] The text

---

1 Cp Agashe *op cit* pp xlviii-l Dc HSL p 298

2 Harichand *Kālidāsa et l art poetique de l Inde* cp Keith ISHL 1929 p 182

3 See ed Ananta Lal and Upendra Jhā cp Bibliog It is on the basis of KA I 2 त्रियत काव्यलक्षणम ।

4 Vijjakā (end of 7th century) quotes KA I 1 (last line) as Danḍin s नीलोत्पलदलश्यामा विज्जकां माम् अजानता । वृथैव दण्डिना प्रोक्त सर्व शुक्ला सरस्वती ॥ Apabhramśa poet Svayambhu (8th cent A D) refers to him in his *Harivamśapurāna* and *Paumacariu* cp *Hindi Kāvya dhārā* ed Rahula Sankrityayana pp 22 24 He has been mentioned in the *Siyabaslakara* (846-66 A D) his work has been drawn upon

of the work, however, seems to have come down to us in incomplete form, as we have indicated above

Recently Jaya Shankar Tripathi has doubted the genuineness of the third chapter of the work He has pointed out certain points of inconsistency between the 'genuine and 'spurious parts of the work with regard to the arrangement of matter and language and style [1] He makes a particular reference to the depiction of Varaha (Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu) in the third *chapter with the Earth placed on Śeṣa (after she was lifted up* by the god in Varāha form from the depths of the ocean) [2] The depiction, according to him, refers to the Varaha image of the Udayagiri near Vidiśā of about 400 A D, while the scene depicted in the first chapter without the Śeṣa serpent[3] represents in his view an earlier phase in delineation of the event in art and literature But the evidence is meagre and inconclusive the difference in the two scenes being at best incidental without any historical bearing The *non inclusion* of Śeṣa in the scene portrayed in the first chapter is merely casual and, as such, cannot be taken to prove that the 'genuine' *Kavyādarśa* (the first two chapters) was composed before 400 A D, the third chapter having been appended to it afterwards as opined by Tripathi [4] It may be pointed out that the scene has been depicted at a *number of places in other works of Daṇḍin also without* a reference to the serpent therein [5] The other arguments referring to the arrangement of matter and language and style advanced for the spuriousness of the third chapter are still less convincing

---

profusely by Nṛpatuṅga (815–75 A D) in *Kavirājamārga* also cp for refs to him and to KA as his work *Pratihārenduraja* (on Udbhaṭa) Namisādhu (on RKAL I 2), Abhinavagupta (AB) etc cp b low ch III also

1 Cp DSKI pp 400 8

2 KA III 25 उन्धृत्य राजकादुर्वी ध्रियतेऽच भुजेन त । वराहणोऽपृता यागो वराहस्तारि स्थिता ॥

3 KA I 73 हरिणोद्धृता । भू गुरस्कृष्णनागासृग्लाहितादुपे
Śeṣa is depicted in another scene in KA II 188

4 DSKI pp 400 ff 429-30

5 Cp DKC p 138 ASK pp 22 27 43 75 80 103 205 242

The second work traditionally attributed to Daṇḍin is the *Daśakumaracarita* While errors in traditional ascription are not denied, there is no ample ground for doubting the manuscript tradition as well as the specific mention of *Dasakumāracarita* as a work of Dandin in Telugu and Kannada versions of the romance [1] A Sanskrit work named *Abhijñānaśakuntalacarcā* by an anonymous author of 15th century A D quotes a passage from the *Daśakumaracarita* as Dandin's [2] As seen above there was no tradition whatsoever of differentiating Daṇḍin from *Ācarya* Dandin and there is, in fact strong evidence in favour of their being identical [3] Thus the position is quite safe for regarding the *Dasakumaracarita* as a work of Dandin, and the majority of scholars favour this view [4]

Connected with the *Daśakumaracarita* there is one serious problem that appertains to its prelude in various versions, called *Purvapiṭhikā* or *Purvavṛttantadarsana*, and a conclusion, similarly in many forms called *Uttarapiṭhikā* or *Dasakumāracaritasesa* or simply a ninth *ucchvasa* which have been doubted for good reasons to be the genuine work of Daṇḍin That these *piṭhikas* form no part of Dandin s original text seems suggested at once by their names and this view is confirmed by overwhelming evidence [5] The title *Dasakumaracarita* suggests accounts of ten princes but the present extent of *Dasakumāracarita* proper contains with an abrupt commencement, the account of eight princes the last incomplete in eight *ucchvāsas* The *Purvapiṭhikā* prefixes the tales of two princes in order to make up the

---

1 Cp colophon in one paper MS (14035 A in TSS lib) palm leaf MS No 10635 of *ib* also cp Telugu DKC of Ketana (c 1225-1300) intro verse and Kannada trans intro verse For Ketana cp EHD pt IX p 699 K A Nilakanta Sastri HSI 1966 ed p 409

2 Cp ASC p 81 DKC p 196 (beneficial results of chase) cp S K Pillai ASK pref p 3 For the prob date of the work cp K Raghavan Pillai ASC intro pp v-vi

3 Cp above ch I

4 Cp Keith HSL p 296 Kane HSP pp 94-5 De HSL pp 207 ff etc De however doubts the identity of the authors of DKC and KA cp above

5 Cp Keith HSL p 298

required number, while the *Uttarapīṭhikā* completes the story of Viśruta, left unfinished in the last *ucchvāsa* of Daṇḍin s text, and finally concludes the narrative [1]

These *pīṭhikas* are definitely known to be the work of different hands There are at least three versions of the Prelude (1) the current *Pūrvapīṭhikā*, beginning with the verse *brahmandacchatradanda* etc, in five *ucchvāsas* (2) the *Pūrva vṛttantadarśana*, ascribed to Bhaṭṭanārayana in the colophon by the scribe, in three *ucchvasas*, and (3) a prelude in verse in three chapters by Vinayaka [2] Similarly, the Conclusion exists at least in four forms (1) the current *Uttarapīṭhikā*, not divided into *ucchvāsas*, (2) *Daśakumaracaritaseṣa* in four *ucchvāsas*, known to be the work of comparatively modern writer named Cakrapāni Dikṣita, (3) a ninth *ucchvāsa* by Padmanābha and (4) a continuation by Gopīnātha Kavirāja [3]

The fact that numerous efforts to supply an introduction and a conclusion are known to have been made suggests that the current *Pūrvapīṭhikā* and *Uttarapīṭhika* were not accorded general acceptance as Daṇḍin s work, while the various attempts stand no claim whatsoever It is also important to note that these versions do not agree with each other in language and style and in extent and contents While the current *Pūrvapīṭhikā* is in greater detail and better style, Bhaṭṭanārāyana s *Pūrvavṛttantadarśana* is sketchy and is quite an inferior production The details of incidents also vary considerably in the two versions [4] As regards the *Uttarapīṭhika* the current

---

1 Cp below pt III also Keith *loc cit* De HSL p 210

2 Cp (1) Kale ed. NSP ed etc (2) given in the App of Agashe s ed pp 147-5? this Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa is different from the famous author of *Veṇīsaṃhāra* cp Agashe *op cit* p xxiv (3) noticed by Eggeling Ind Off Cat vii No 4067l/586 a p 1553

3 Cp (1) Kale ed NSP ed etc (2) cp Eggeling Ind. Off Cat vii No 4069/2934 p 1553 cp NSP first ed. (3) published from Madras noticed by R V Krishnamacharya cp Agashe *op cit* p xxiv (4) cp Eggeling *op cit* vii No 4070 1850 p 1554 This Gopīnātha is mentioned by Aufrecht as the author of DKK (1677 A D) cp Agashe *op cit* pp xxiv-xxv

4 In PVD we have Matiśarman for Sitavarman Dharmapāla is stated to have two sons Kāmapāla and Sumitra while Padmodbhava three

one is better and more concise than the one by Cakrapāṇi Dikṣita which is far inferior in style The other forms also do not square with one another in point of extent and contents

Again, these *pīṭhikas* are not fully consistent with the narrative of Daṇḍin and apart from the great difference in language and style, there are innumerable discrepancies in the details of events While in the ancestry of Rājavahana Puṣpodbhava Apahāravarman, Upahāravarman and Visruta, there is no material discrepancy the accounts of Arthapāla and Pramati cannot be reconciled The striking discrepancies are as follows (1) In Daṇḍin s text, Arthapāla and Pramati are Kāmapala s sons by Kāntimati and Tārāvali respectively, while in the current *Pūrvapīṭhikā* Arthapāla is Tārāvali s son and Pramati is not his half brother, but a son of Sumati [1] (2) When, in Daṇḍin, Caṇḍavarman finds Rajavāhana with the princess he derides him as an imposter who has under the cloak of religion attracted the silly people who falsely attribute divine powers to him [2] but the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* has nothing of this (3) While Upaharavarman s own tale in Daṇḍin s text is that he was brought up by a monk, the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* ascribes the task

Ratnodbhava Sumantra and Suśruta (instead of Dharmapala having three sons and Padmodbhava two as in PP where Sumitra is the son of Dharmapala) As the story proceeds we find more discrepancies in detail In PVD the gift of Śiva is a *śula* instead of a *gadā* in the story of finding Somadatta the *brāhmana* wanders in Daṇḍaka instead of the bank of Kāverī in Somadatta s story Kuluta is mentioned instead of Lāṭa in the story of finding Puṣpodbhava the sage is described as merely wandering on the sea shore instead of as returning from his ablutions in Rāmatirtha and in the same story we find mention of Yavanadvipa instead of Kālayavanadvipa Besides the current PP describes the marriage of Avantisundarī with Rājavāhana as brought about by a magician (cp ASKS VII 54 ff) while PVD says that the hero simply found an opportunity of entering the princess apartment where the magician was exhibiting a thunder storm.

1 Cp DKC pp 126 127 135 143 PP pp 15 19 also PVD It is possible however that as Kale (notes on DKC p 142) thinks Tārāvalī addresses Pramati as son on his being friend of her son as Indian lad es generally do This seems to be supported also by the similarity of names Sumati and Pramati

2. Cp DKC pp 56-7

to the king[1] (4) The account given of the nurse of Upahāra varman in *Pūrvapīṭhikā* differs in several points from that found in the original text of Daṇḍin[2] (5) The daughter of Upahāra varman s nurse speaks of marriage overtures made to her by a *Śabara* and of her rescue from that plight through the efforts of a servant of the king of Mithila,[3] an incident not mentioned in the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* (6) The fact that Prahāravarman on hearing that his kingdom has been annexed by his nephews, sets out for Suhma in order to take military assistance from his sister s son, the king of Suhma, and enters a forest on his way which has been described in Daṇḍin s work,[4] has not been mentioned in *Pūrvapīṭhikā* (7) So also the part of the story of Tārāvalī that she, while returning from Malaya mountain after paying her respects to Lopāmudrā, saw an infant weeping in the cemetery at Vārānasī and came to know from Kubera that the infant was the son of Kāntimatī,[5] is simply absent in the *Pūrvapīṭhikā*

Apart from these discrepancies[6] the current *Pūrvapīṭhikā* lacks the grace and finish of the genuine text and contains unfelicitous errors of grammar and idiom[7] Again it presents certain peculiarities of diction which we seldom find in Daṇḍin s

---

1 Cp DKC p 105 PP p 16
2 Cp PP p 14 with DKC p 103
3 Cp DKC p 104
4 Cp DKC p 103 also cp ASK p 165 ff
5 Cp DKC pp 126-7 in PVD however the incident occurs
6 Keith saw a few more discrepancies in PP e g (a) Acc to Daṇḍin Viśruta is descended from the merchant Vaiśravana and is grandson of Sindhudatta (p 202) but in PP he is the grandson of Padmodbhava (pp 4 12) (b) The scene at the end of the current PP does not accord with the beginning of the text of Daṇḍin But while the second discrepancy is just negligible the first is well explained away by the v l *Sindhudatta* (for *Sindhudatta*) preferred in the text of Agashe s ed (p 139)
7 Cp (a) grammatical errors like *mahadabhikhya* (p 12, also cp pp 18 53 *parīkṣan* (p 40) *uttartam* (p 9) etc (b) redundant use of words as of *bhāyah* for alliteration (p 5) (c) loose diction as in *bhasmīkṛta cetane makaraketane* (p 3) etc (d) solecism as in the use of *sahāya* for *sāhāyya* (p 7) etc

text.[1] There is unevenness of style as between one *ucchvāsa* and another, and two hands may be distinguished even in the *Purvapīṭhikā* itself[2] It may also be noted that the usual metrical preface required by the theory in the beginning of a *kathā* or an *ākhyāyikā* is absent here It at once plunges into the narrative with the solitary verse in *sragdhara* metre, *brahmāṇḍacchattradaṇḍa* etc, quoted anonymously by Bhoja in his *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa*[3] The case of *Purvarṛttāntadarsana*, which reads almost like a school boy s summary,[4] need hardly be discussed even if it is more concise and consistent both in order of narration and the nature of incidents than the current *Purvapīṭhikā*[5] The prelude in verse also stands no claim what soever

The position of *Uttarapīṭhikā* is still worse There are frequent variations from the text of Daṇḍin The reference to Mānasāra and his defeat and death at the hands of Rājavāhana and his companions seems to be confused since the reigning king of Malava then was Darpasara[6] and not Manasara unless we suppose that Mānasāra resumed the reins of government of Ujjayini The name of Vasumdhara has been wrongly given as Vasumati here[7] Again this is full of grammatical faults,[8] and

---

1 The characteristic features are (a) fondness for alliteration cp pp 3 4 5 esp cp p 23 कुमारा माराभिरामा रामाद्यपौरुषा रुषा भस्मीकृतारयो रयोपहसितसमीरणा रणाभियानेन यानेन (b) love for passive forms e g *abhāni* (p 10) *samabodhi* (p 11) *agāmi* (p 18) etc (c) fondness for denominatives e g *nikaṣāyamāna* (p 1) etc cp pp 2 3 37 42 45 49 etc (d) love for the use of *avadhīrita* (p 3) *nyakkṛta* (p 4) etc. in comparison cp pp 5 10 13 22 23 (e) repetition of some favourite usages like *vilolālaka bālaka* (pp 14 20) *natāṅgi* (pp 17 48 50 51 etc) *pracchāyaśītala* (pp 17 29 34 cp once in DKC p 126) *hetitati* (pp 8 23 24) etc

2 The first *ucch* is the most crude while the last is far better than other *ucchs* cp Agashe *op cit* p xx Keith HSL p 299 We may suppose however that the writer acquired greater skill as he proceeded on

3 Cp SKA (ed. Borooah 1884) p 114

4 Cp Kale DKC intro p xxxvii

5 See above also cp Agashe *op cit* pp xxi xxv

6 Cp DKC p 57 also cp PP p 38

7 See UP p 212

8 E g *abhyahanat* (p 212) *rājyadhuh* p 213 for *-dhurā* (cp Pāṇ V 4 74 etc

is less ambitious in language and style The *Śeṣa* by Cakrapāṇi Dīkṣita is still more objectionable, its style does not fit in with Daṇḍin s in point of purity and force [1]

That these are later substitutes of the lost original portion is also confirmed by the fact that the older commentators have not commented upon these parts[2] and that some manuscripts and certain early editions do not contain them [3] The authors of the current *pīṭhikās* have remained unknown and it is therefore, natural that in manuscripts the entire work should be frequently found attributed to Daṇḍin [4]

Now, we are faced with the question how to explain the curious phenomenon that the work presents The authors of the supplements have offered no explanation and thus we are left to resort to conjectures According to J Hertel, Daṇḍin left the work as we have it with an abrupt beginning and incomplete for some reason or other [5] The view, however, is unconvincing and the argument that if these parts of Daṇḍin s work had ever existed they would not have been lost is simply unacceptable [6] It is definite that the *Daśakumāracarita* once existed in complete form, at least it did have a beginning since, though an author may sometime leave his work incomplete towards the close, he would hardly begin it abruptly in the middle *J Hertel also made the surmise that Daṇḍin s plan*

1 Cp Kale DKC intro p xxxvii
2 E g the comm Pada Bhuṣ and Laghu (NSP ed.)
3 E g (a) Ind Off Cat MS No 4059 2694 Eggeling Ind Off Cat vii p 1551 (b) the Calcutta ed of Madanamohana Tarkālaṁkara 1849 Agashe s ed does not contain UP acc to him the statement in PVD (p 149) that Rājahaṁsa recovered his lost kingdom through the favour of Vāmadeva leaves no room for the *Śeṣa* or UP cp *op cit* p xxiii
4 For rejecting the PP as genuine work of Daṇḍin K S Mahadeva Sastri (ASK intro pp 9 22) and G H Sastri (ASKS intro pp iii iv) put forward the evidence of ASK and its *Sāra* presuming that ASK is the genuine prelude to DKC and elaborate the points of difference the presumption however is not tenable see below
5 DKC, intro cp Keith HSL p 297
6 Cp Keith HSL p 298

extended far beyond what he has accomplished, he found allusions in the *Dasakumaracarita* to a scheme which would have related the history of the king Kāmapāla and his five wives in three births,[1] so that what we have is a mere fragment[2] The conjecture is based on a very slender ground, and there is nothing whatsoever of substantial nature to prove the hypothesis

Equally implausible is the suggestion that the *Avantisundarikathā* is the lost prelude to the *Dasakumāracarita*, which question we shall discuss later H H Wilson made the conjecture that some of the disciples of Daṇḍin filled in a sketch approved by the author and each one tried his hand and that possibly the longest and the one which made an approach in manner and diction to the work of the preceptor was finally accepted[3] The conjecture though very ingenious, must be discarded in view of the existence of various versions of the *pīṭhika* some of which are evidently late productions, and also because some manuscripts do not have them[4]

In fact, Daṇḍin did complete his work, and it appears that the work most probably contained a prelude introducing the ten princes and describing their setting out for the quarter conquest Rājavahana s parting from them to help Matanga the princes wandering about separately in search of Rājavāhana and finally their re union followed by the tales of the ten princes[5] in ten *ucchvāsas* and then a conclusion describing their return to the capital and eventually their ruling over diffe rent countries as feudatories of the sovereign, Rājavahana

1 See DKC p 127 cp Kale s notes thereon

2 Cp Keith *op cit* p 297

3 Cp Agashe (*op cit* p xxi) who mentions the surmise of Wilson and seems to give it his support

4 Cp HSL p 210 fn

5 G H Sastri (ASKS intro p iii) says that Daṇḍin s scheme of the story contained not ten but eleven boys He thinks that PP has left out Devarakṣita the son of Satyaśarman who was posted to watch the entrance of the cave which Rājavāhana entered (cp pt III) The view which is apparently based on the presumption that ASK is a prelude to DKC is unwarranted, see below

Later, perhaps after the 13th century A D, when Ketana translated the original work into Telugu,[1] a considerable portion in the beginning including the prelude and the subsequent two *ucchvāsas* and a half and also the concluding portion along with a small part of the tenth *ucchvāsa* came to be lost Some admirers of his work who either remembered the account of the lost portion or had some other source, supplied the missing part to the best of their ability, of course, trying to follow the style of the original text As the current supplements betray a comparative modernity, it is possible that their authors reconstructed the lost portion from Telugu version of the original made by the poet Ketana in the middle of 13th century A D[2] This fact is testified to by the close agreement between the current Sanskrit text and the Telugu version[3] and by the presence in the current *Pūrvapīṭhikā* of several idioms and usages prevalent only in Telugu language The express mention by Ketana that he is translating Daṇḍin's book[4] indicates that he had before him the full text of the work The authors of the supplements either perhaps deliberately or probably in confusion termed their additions in the beginning and at the end as a prelude and a

---

1 Cp for Ketana s date A R Sarasvati QJMS XIII p 681 also see above

2 Cp M R Kavi ASK pref p 14 K S Mahadeva Sastri ASK intro p 9 But G Harihara Sastri (ASK intro p iv) places the revision of the work before Ketana This, however does not seem to be probable for in this case the influence of Telugu idiom on PP is not accounted for D (HSL pp 210 1 fn) holds that the prelude must have been prefixed at least before 11th cent on the ground that the stanza *brahmāṇḍa* etc of PP has been quoted in Bhoja s SKA (ed Boroosh 1884 p 114) But as he himself says the citation is anonymous The verse is also cited along with five other benedictory ones in Bhoja s Subh Pr (D c Coll Coll No 248-vis) and is quoted under *Ālls* in Śārṅg It may be noted that it is not cited by Thomas under Daṇḍin in *Kavīndravacanasamuccaya* All these anonymous references do not help us much

3 There are a few minor differences also e g the story of Somadatta comes after the meeting of Rājavāhana and Avantisundarī but before their marriage (as in ASK cp ASKS VII 1 ff) and that the later portion is very much condensed in Telugu cp M R Kavi *op cit* p 14

4 Cp M R Kavi *loc cit*

conclusion respectively, regardless of the fact that their supplements contained matter more than the original introduction and conclusion possessed Thus, in confusion, the lost prelude and also the two *ucchvāsas* and a half (of the third *ucchvāsa*) were reconstituted and prefixed as the extant *Pūrvapīṭhikā* which itself was divided into three or five *ucchvāsas* Similarly, the original conclusion and a portion of the lost tenth *ucchvāsa* were reconstituted and suffixed as the *Uttarapīṭhikā* or *Śeṣa* in one or four *ucchvāsas* Probably in order to make the things appear natural the numbering of *ucchvāsas* was changed, the original third *ucchvāsa* having been made the first, the fourth numbered as second and so on This fact accounts for the abrupt commencement of the story of Rajavahana in the first *ucchvāsa* as also for the incomplete story of Visruta in the last *ucchvāsa* in the genuine text of Daṇḍin We may have an idea of the supposed original planning of the work of Daṇḍin vis a vis the present *Daśakumaracarita* with its current *pīṭhikās*, from the following table

Supposed original text	*Extant text with 'pīṭhikās'*
Prelude	*Pūrvapīṭhikā*
(Introduction of the ten princes their setting out for quarter conquest and Rājavahana's parting from his companions)	I (Introduction of the ten princes) II (Setting out for quarter conquest and Rājavahana's parting from his companions)
The stories of the princes	
I (Story of Puṣpodbhava)	III (Story of Somadatta)
II (Story of Somadatta)	IV (Story of Puṣpodbhava)
III (Story of Rājavāhana)	V (Story of Rajavāhana—incomplete) *Daṇḍin's Text* I (Story of Rājavāhana completed)
IV (as in extant text)	II (Story of Apaharavarman)
V (" ")	III (Story of Upahāravarman)
VI (" ")	IV (Story of Arthapāla)
VII (" ")	V (Story of Pramati)
VIII (" ")	VI (Story of Mitragupta)
IX (" ")	VII (Story of Mantragupta)
X (Story of Viśruta)	VIII (Story of Viśruta—incomplete) *Uttarapīṭhikā* (a) Story of Viśruta, completed
Conclusion	(b) Conclusion

The other romance attributed to Daṇḍin is *Avantisundarī Kathā*[1] which also unfortunately has come down to us in incomplete form[2], as is evidenced by its anonymous summary(*Kathasara*) in verse, which though itself incomplete carries the tale further up to the beginning of the story of Upahāravarman [3] According to the colophon of the *Kathā* the name of the work is *Avantisundarī* and that of its author, Ācārya Daṇḍin In the introduction to the main narrative, it has been stated, in a manner similar to that followed by Bāṇa in his *Harṣacarita*, that the story was narrated by Daṇḍin at the instance of his friends [4] That the work belongs to Daṇḍin is further confirmed by a reference to, and a quotation from, the work as Daṇḍin's in the *Nāmasaṃgrahamālā* of Appaya Dīkṣita (middle of 16th century)[5]

---

1 A fragment of the work which was based on a very defective MS discovered from Kottakkal in Malabar was published in 1924 by M R Kavi This ed covered only 25 pages in print It was with reference to this ed. that Keith (HSL, pref p xvi) remarked that it should never have been published from one mutilated MS But the new ed. of the work published from Trivandrum in 1954 is based on a far fuller MS though fragmentary and runs to 246 printed pages carrying the story to the episode of Kādambarī see below pt III ch III

2. The colophon mentioning the work as complete is evidently a mistake of the scribe who not having found the continuation took the portion for a complete work The extant work covers nearly half the story in PP the subject matter of which is identical cp pt III

3 The ASKS which is a faithful summary of ASK covers the extant portion of ASK in 658 verses (up to V 141) and runs to VIII 125 where it breaks off Cp pt III ch III The writer of ASKS has been conjectured by S Kuppuswami Sastri to be one Pañcaśikha who used (acc to Bhoja's ŚPr XI Josyer ed II p 674) the word *ānanda* in the last stanza of each canto as a distinctive mark which we notice in ASKS but his work, acc to ŚPr itself is *Śudrakakathā* (and not ASKS which is obviously a different work) cp G Harihara Sastri ASKS intro, p iii

4 ASK p 17, ASKS I 57 63 II 1-2 cp Hcar p 92

5 Cp transcript of the MS in Madras Govt Oriental MSS Lib p 58 (अस्ति पल्लवेषु काञ्ची नाम नगरी इत्यवन्तिसुन्दरीये दण्डिप्रयोगात्, cp ASK p 8 नवस्वभावनानापल्लवेषु (पल्लवेषु) राजा बभूव, and p 6 काञ्चीपुरं नाम राजधानी V Raghavan (AOR X pt 2, pp 459-61) places the quotation in DKC, VI (sub-story of Gomini) p 159

and also by the citation of a verse from it under Daṇḍin's name in the *Suktiratnahara* of Kalingarāya Sūrya (middle of 13th or the first half of 14th century),[1] as pointed out by V Raghavan [2] It may also be noted that the meaning of the panegyric of the poetess Gangadevi (c 1350 A D), who glorifies Ācārya Dandin's poetry as sipped in ambrosia and as a jewelled mirror of Sarasvatī [3] can well be understood with reference to the *Avantisundarikatha* which on one hand, displays a fine delineation of sentiments (and hence is sipped in ambrosia) and on the other, exhibits the author s pedantic scholarship (in other words beautifully mirrors Sarasvatī) and which has the characteristics worthy of a poet of the calibre of Ācarya Daṇḍin Besides the work, which conforms strictly to the rules neither of a *katha* nor of an *ākhyayika* implicitly follows the dictum of the *Kāvyadarsa* which refuses to accept the fine distinctions between the two species of prose *kavya* [4]

Some scholars[5] doubt the ascription on the ground that there is a striking difference in style and diction of the work from that followed in the other romance, *Dasakumāracarita* which is unanimously attributed to Daṇḍin S K De conjectures that 'some later author ambitious of writing a romance in the approved vein of Bana s works (with which he appears to have been well acquainted)simply took the story of Avantisundari from the original lost prelude of the *Daśakumaracarita* and embellished it in the approved fashion [6] He however, holds that the *Avantisundarikatha* was composed before the fixing of the characteristics of *katha* and *ākhyayika* in Rudraṭa's time (9th century), which fact according to him explains 'the apparent

1 Cp TSS ed 141 p 4 v 17 cp the v in ASK p 1 v 3 cp for his date V Raghavan JOR xiii pp 293–306 As V Raghavan (*op cit* p 294) points out the Madras MSS 3813 and 4127 give the name of Daṇḍin (which the TSS does not give) as the source of the verse

2 Cp JOR xiii p 294 AOR V pt ii p 4

3 Cp MV I 10 for her date cp De HSL p 418

4 Cp KA I 28

5 Cp De IHQ I p 31 ff III p 394 ff (ASL p 299 ff), Keith HSL p 296 fn pref p xvi

6 Cp ASL p 306

confusion of the characteristics of a *kathā* and *ākhyāyikā* made by its author' He places its author 'not very far from the time of the author of the *Daśakumāracarita* whose work he utilises and whose biographical details were not yet entirely lost in his time'[1] A B Keith follows De in the view that *Avantisundarī kathā* is by some different hand He, however, discards the suggestion that its author lived sufficiently soon after the famous Daṇḍin to be familiar with his genealogy and to work it into his story, and assigns to him a period 'centuries later than the great Daṇḍin'[2] The main ground on which the above scholars object to the *Kathā* being a work of Daṇḍin of the fame of *Daśakumāracarita* or to its being assigned to the period to which the famous Daṇḍin belongs is 'the extraordinary difference of style between the two works, a point which cannot fail to strike even the most careless reader'[3]

We have seen,[4] however, that the difference can very well be accounted for, and this, therefore, should not present any difficulty Other objections made to Daṇḍin's authorship of the work are[5] (i) the presence of supernatural element about the *Gandharva* who sings an *āryā* verse of Dāmodara[6] (ii) the half biographical and half fanciful nature of the story of Daṇḍin[7] (iii) want of a clear indication of the author in the body of the work, (iv) non mention of the *Kirātārjunīya* when its author has been mentioned[8] and (v) the meagre extent of the text Some of these objections, and especially the last, evidently refer to the older edition of the work, and as such, they do not hold good now when we possess a much fuller text of the book As regards the first objection, it may be remarked that there is in fact

1 *Op cit* p 308
2 HSL, pref pp xvi xvii
3 Cp De ASL pp 303-5
4 See above ch I (the question of common authorship of DKC and ASK)
5 Cp for these objections De IHQ III pp 398-402 (ASL p 306 ff) Kane HSP p 98 fn
6 Cp ASK p 9 ASKS I 16
7 Cp ASK pp 9 17 ASKS I 15 62 cp below ch IV
8 Cp ASK p 10; ASKS I 23

nothing supernatural in the *Gandharva's* story except that he is a *Gandharva*. The *Gandharva* has been referred to as *abhinava gandharva* and it may be taken, with more plausibility, to mean simply a young singer.[1] As the *katha* has, a young '*gandharva*' appears in the court of the king, Simhaviṣṇu of Kāñcī and sings an *ārya* verse. When asked about the author of the verse, he mentions Damodarasvamin as its composer, and the king manages in due course to bring the poet in his own court. The story of Dandin, again, is fully biographical, it is only the description of the circumstances leading to his narration of the story of the *kathā* which is somewhat fanciful. After recording the biographical detail of Daṇḍin the work narrates that he was once invited by Lalitalaya an architect, to inspect a statue of Visnu one of whose arms (that was broken somehow) he had plastered and to examine whether the plastering was successful and was worthy of the great image. Daṇḍin visits the statue on the sea shore of Mahāmallapura with the architect and his friends. There they notice that a big red lotus floating over the sea touches the feet of the image and suddenly turns into a *Vidyadhara* who after making obeisance to the deity disappears in the sky. At his friends request to unravel the mystery Daṇḍin observes a course of austerities and worships Viṣṇu by whose grace the mystery is revealed to him in the form of the story of Avantisundari which he narrates to his friends. Since the story of Avantisundari is imaginary and not based on historical facts as that of Harṣa the author skilfully depicts its fanciful revelation to him by the grace of the god, Visnu unlike of course, Bana who introduces his *akhyayika* as having been based on his personal knowledge of Harṣa's life. Again there is a clear indication of Daṇḍin's authorship of the work in the body of the text itself.[2] The non mention of *Kirata rjuniya* cannot be taken to prove much. There is no ground, therefore for doubting Daṇḍin's authorship of the *Avanti sundarikatha*. P V Kane and other scholars[3] though inclined

1 For *gandharva* meaning a singer in general cp Apte & MW
2 ASK pp 11-2 17 cp ASKS I 32 57 63
3 Cp Kane HSP p 98 and fn K V Laksmana Rao *Vividhajñānavistara* (a Marathi journal), liv No 8

to accept the attribution, hesitated to declare the same due to some of the aforesaid objections which we have just answered

The *Avantisundarīkathā* is regarded by some scholars as the lost, and now recovered prelude to the *Daśakumaracarita* Thus it is suggested that *Avantisundarīkathā* is the first portion of the whole story, the *Daśakumāracarita* in its genuine form (without the *Pūrvapīṭhikā*) is the middle part and there was one *ucchvāsa* for the *Uttarapīṭhikā* [1] It is said that the *Avantisundarī kathā* was broken to fragments long ago with its earlier portion preserved in Kerala When the earlier part was not available and the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* was prefixed to the work, it came to be called *Daśakumāracarita*, the stories in it being divided into *ucchvāsas* [2]

The theory owes its existence to the fact that both the works deal with the common theme (the story of Rājavahana and his friends), the extant portion of the *Avantisundarīkathā* treating the earlier part and the authentic text of the *Daśakumara carita*, the later part thereof The *Avantisundarīkathā* takes the story half way towards the real *Daśakumaracarita* of Daṇḍin and breaks off near the point where the prince Rājavāhana enters the chasm with Mātaṅga to help him win his love Mandākinī, leaving his friends behind Its verse summary carries the tale still further and reaches as far as the middle of the story of Upahāravarman as we find it in the *Daśakumāra carita*, presenting unmistakable points of resemblance with the latter The fact has been made the basis for the belief that *Daśakumāracarita* is a continuation of the *Avantisundarīkathā*, the gap in story between the two works caused by the loss of manuscript being supplied by the summary of the latter The theory gets some support from the fact that Rājaśekhara speaks only of three works of Daṇḍin, which, according to the scholars now, are *Kāvyādarśa Dvisamdhānakāvya* and *Avantisundarīkathā*

1 Cp V Raghavan in JKUML, vol VII, ŚPr pp 836 7 Kane HSP pp 97, 98-9 G Harihara Sastri ASKS intro pp i iv S K Pillai ASK pref p 4

2 Cp G Harihara Sastri ASKS intro pp ii and iii-iv

The *Dasakumaracarita* thus being the fourth book presents a problem which it is sought to be solved by the supposition that it was not an independent work and merely formed a part of the *Avantisundarikathā*. It is further said that the title *Daśakumāra carita* is mentioned nowhere in Sanskrit literature [1]. But while the statement of Rājaśekhara may well be interpreted to mean that Dandin wrote three literary compositions (*prabandhas*), namely *Daśakumaracarita*, *Dvisamdhānakāvya* and *Avantisundarikatha*, besides the *Kavyādarsa* which is (not a *prabandha*, but) a work on Poetics, as we have seen above. The argument of non mention of *Dasakumāracarita* in the classical writings is a negative evidence and as such cannot be taken to prove much. Besides the non mention of the work may reasonably be attributed to the fact that it seldom found favour with the scrupulous critics (who generally preferred to refer in their manuals to the works of Bana and Subandhu instead), on account of its disregard of conventions and not coming up to the mark according to the literary standards set by them.

The theory of *Dasakumaracarita* forming a part of the *Avantisundarikatha* is sought to be further supported by the colophon of the first *ucchvasa* in a manuscript of the former work which reads इत्यवन्तिसुन्दर्यां दशकुमारचरिते प्रथम चरितम् [2] and indicates that the name of the work was *Avantisundari* and that *Dasakumaracarita* formed a part thereof. But if the name *Dasakumaracarita* was given to the middle portion later, as the theory suggests the colophon should not have made a reference to *Dasakumaracarita*. Either the colophon which stands suspectedly solitary is the result of some scribal confusion or there is some error of omission [3]. Moreover the title *Avanti*

---

1 Cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 836–7

2. Cp TSS Lib Univ Coll No 412 referred to by K S M Sastri in ASK intro p 22

3 The first *ucchvāsa* of DKC is styled in the colophon as *Rājavāhana carita* while the *ucch* V of PP (the story of which is continued in *ucch* I of Daṇḍin) is named *Avantisundarīparinaya*. The original complete text of Daṇḍin probably styled the *ucch* as *Avantisundarī-Rājavāhana-carita*. Thus the colophon in question should have been इति दशकुमारचरितेऽवन्तिसुन्दरीराजवाहनचरित नाम प्रथम उच्छ्वास ।

sundarīkathā is a misfit in case the entire text of Daṇḍin's *Daśa kumāracarita* is considered to be the middle part thereof. As a matter of fact the titles of the two romances are appropriate only when they are regarded as independent works. Besides we have got a long tradition which differentiates the two titles or works. While the name *Daśakumāracarita* is distinctly given to the simpler romance in the colophons of the manuscripts as well as in Telugu and Kanarese versions of the text which clearly mention the title *Daśakumaracarita*, the name of the other romance is clearly mentioned as *Avantisundarīkatha* in the colophon as also in the interior of the work,[1] and again it is confirmed by Appayya Dīkṣita and Vadijanghala[2] and also by the title of its summary called *Avantisundarīkathāsara*.

That the *Avantisundarīkatha* could not have been a prelude to the current *Daśakumaracarita* is further evidenced by the great divergence of style of narration between the two works.[3] While *Daśakumaracarita* has been composed in an unaffected style the other romance clearly exhibits a strong influence on the author of the orthodox conventions and tendencies of the age in general and of the works of Subandhu and Bāṇa in particular. The manner of story telling too, is essentially different in the two works. The style of narration and the enclosing of various episodic tales within a tale as well as the extended measure of descriptive material in *Avantisundarī kathā* when compared with the simple and direct narrative in the *Daśakumaracarita* give a clear indication that the work was an independent treatment of the story of Avantisundarī, embellished in the best literary fashion of the age.

Besides the theory which regards the *Daśakumāracarita* as having originally formed a part of *Avantisundarīkathā* would

1 ASK p 17

2 Cp Appayya in *Nāmasaṃgrahamālā* quoted above. cp Vādijanghāla on KA I 81 (cp *Deccan College Descriptive Catalogue* xii No 125 p 137 for the comm.). cp also Kane HSP p 93 M R Kavi's ASK intro pp 12 3 M Krishnamachariar HCSL p 457

3 D (IHQ III pp 393-432 reprinted in ASL pp 303 ff) however advanced this argument for rejecting the common authorship of DKC and ASK

suggest that the *Kathāsāra* utilised the extant *Daśakumāracarita* of Daṇḍin for its summary of the stories of Rajavāhana Avantisundari, Apahāravarman and Upahāravarman And if this be so there should have been complete agreement as regards the details of narrative between the *Kathāsara* (VII 79—VIII 125) and its supposed original *Dasakumāracarita* (pp 54–108) as we notice it between *Avantisundarikatha* (extant portion) and the *Kathasara* (I 1—V 140) But an examination of the two texts reveals that there are at places disagreements between the two Some of the striking differences are given below

1 The *Kathasara* does not mention the wooden cage into which Rājavāhana is said to have been put by Caṇḍavarman in the *Dasakumaracarita* [1]

2 The *Kathāsāra* has Sumañjari for Suratamañjari of *Dasakumaracarita* [2] The summary it may be noted is nowhere seen changing the proper names of the original for metrical reasons

3 According to the *Dasakumaracarita* the nymph's necklace fell on the sage Mārkaṇḍeya when he was taking his bath in Mandodaka lake, while the *Kathāsara* records that it fell on the sage when he had just finished the *aghamarsana*, his daily prayer [3]

4 According to *Kathāsara* it is Apahāravarman who effects the release of Simhavarman the king of Campā while the *Daśakumaracarita* attributes the task to his friend, Dhana mitra who is again credited with bringing the princes to Rājavāhana [4]

5 In the *Kathasara* Dhanamitra is introduced to Raja vahana after the release of the Campā ruler and the prince s re-union with his friends, while in *Daśakumaracarita* he is introduced to the prince before the release and the re union which he himself brings about for Apahāravarman [5]

---

1 DKC p 57 ASKS VII 80 ff
2 ASKS VII 87 DKC p 59
3 Cp DKC p 60 ASKS VII 88
4 Cp ASKS VII 94 DKC pp 63 63-4
5 ASKS VIII 2 DKC p 63

6 In the summary Prahāravarman is said to have been defeated and captured in battle by his nephew, Vikaṭavarman, while in the *Daśakumāracarita*, the task is assigned to his nephews Vikaṭavarman and others [1]

These points of divergence in the details of the narrative would confirm the belief that the writer of the summary had before him that portion of the *Avantisundarīkathā*, which is now lost to us and not the present *Daśakumāracarita* which, for the reasons adduced above cannot be taken to have originally formed a part of the full text of the *Avantisundarīkathā*

As noted above the *Daśakumāracarita* was written by the author in his youth while the other romance which represents a developed art and mind was the product of his mature age and an attempt therefore, to establish them as originally one would be futile

One more work, a *Dvisamdhānakāvya* or a poem in *double entendre* is ascribed to Daṇḍin on the authority of Bhoja s *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* which makes a reference to, and a citation from, the work [2] The *kāvya* is unfortunately lost The literary feats discussed in the *Kāvyādarśa* and employed in the two romances are quite in keeping with his authorship of the *Dvisamdhānakāvya* which evidently dealt with the stories of the two Epics simultaneously,[3] and the ascription seems to be correct [4]

From the foregoing discussion, it may safely be concluded that Daṇḍin wrote four books one on Poetics, two romances and a *śleṣakāvya* Now the question arises how to reconcile with the statement of Rājaśekhara who attributes the composition of three *prabandhas* to him According to P V Kane, all

1 ASKS VIII 118 DKC p 104

2 Cp ŚPr XI Josyer ed II p 478 (mentioning the work along with the *Dvisandhāna* of Dhanañjaya) and IX Josyer ed II p 318 making the citation from the *kāvya* cp Madras MS of the work vol II pp 168 9 444 V Raghavan ŚPr pp 837 8 cp Kane HSP pp 100-1 cp BSOS London III p 232 S L Katre IHQ XXIV p 117

3 Cp ŚPr IX (Josyer ed II p 318) XI (p 478 for literary feats in other works cp above ch I

4 Cp Keith HSL pref p xvi fn Kane *loc cit* S L Katre *loc cit* Varadachari HSL p 116 K S Mahadeva Sastri ASK intro pp 9 10 G Harihara Sastri ASKS intro p v

that the verse (of Rājaśekhara) means is that 'three compositions of Dandin are well known in all the three worlds and not that Dandin wrote only three works[1] The interpretation, however, is not convincing It seems rather more plausible to hold that Rājaśekhara meant by three *Dandi prabandhas* only the three poetic compositions of Dandin and not his rhetorical treatise, for the term *prabandha* strictly speaking means a literary production in which sense it has been used by classical writers and especially by Dandin and Rajaśekhara

It would not be out of place here to discuss the probable chronological order of the works of Daṇḍin As noted above, the *Dasakumāracarita* seems to be his first attempt written in unsophisticated prose He had not yet become an *ācarya* and the colophons of the work record him accordingly as Daṇḍin The second work may have been the *Kavyadarśa* written in comparatively mature age The *Avantisundarikathā* is evidently his last work which he might not have been able to complete The colophon of the *Avantisundarikatha* indicates that he had already been famed as an *acārya* when he wrote the work Since we do not possess the *Dvisamdhanakavya*, its exact position cannot be determined It may however be placed after either *Daśakumaracarita* or *Kavyādarsa* but might fall before the *Avantisundarikatha* which is evidently an elaboration in polished form of his earlier romance And most likely he elaborated his first work after having composed the other writings Thus the relative order of his works may be like this (i) *Dasakumaracarita* (ii) *Kavyadarsa* or *Dvisamdhanakavya* (iii) *Dvisamdhanakavya* or *Kavyadarsa* (iv) *Avantisundarikathā*

1 Cp HSP pp 93-4

2. Cp MW Apte (1958 ed) and SKD cp Mālav I (Prologue) Vās intro v 13 Śiś II 73 etc cp also KA II 364 III 131 Rājaśekhara in Sukti also cp Agashe (*op cit* pp li ff) who however advanced this argument for proving that the author of the three *prabandhas* was different from the rhetorician

CHAPTER III

THE DATE OF DANDIN

The problem of the date of Daṇḍin is still an open question, and scholars differ widely in their opinion on the approximate period in which this great writer of Sanskrit literature lived and worked. We shall discuss below the various theories regarding the date of Daṇḍin put forth on the basis of the evidence of the *Kāvyādarśa* and the *Daśakumāracarita* and finally examine the question with reference to the important evidence of the *Avantisundarīkathā* which affords us valuable data for determining the date of the author. The lost *Dvisaṃdhānakāvya* of Daṇḍin cannot help us in the matter, save indicating that it was written much before Bhoja (reign 1005-54 A. D.) who in his *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* mentions and makes a citation from the work.[1] The independent examination of the date of individual works of Daṇḍin will not only strengthen the position of one date by mutual corroboration, but would also provide us with a strong evidence in support of the theory of the common authorship of the works referred to above, in addition to the evidences adduced in the previous chapter.

Much debated but still open to dispute is the question of the date of the *Kāvyādarśa* which we propose to detail and settle below. The upper limit of the date is established by a reference in the work to the *Setubandha* of Pravarasena of fifth century A. D.[2] as also by the probable quotations or adaptations from the works of Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Bāṇa and Bhartṛhari,

---

1. See above ch. II.
2. KA I 34; also cp. ASK p. 20. Pravarasena II was a Vākāṭaka king (c. 410 to 440 A. D.) cp. V. V. Mirashi *Kālidāsa* p. 42; V. S. Agrawal HSA p. 7; according to Keith (HSL p. 97) and De (HSL p. 119) *however he was a king of Kashmir of 5th or 6th century A. D.* Jaya Shankar Tripathi tries without success to identify him with the Vākāṭaka king Pravarasena I (284-344 A. D.)

contained therein The work quotes from Bhasa (c 300 A D) the famous verse *limpatna* etc [1] The case of the other stanza, *mrteti pretya* etc however said to have been cited from his *Svapnavasavadatta* [2] is doubtful [3] Of the verses of Kalidasa (c 400 A D), there are numerous reminiscences in *Kāvyādarsa*, and scholars are unanimous on the point that it owes a number of its illustrations to the great poet [4] One of the examples of *varnaniyama* in the work containing the only consonant *n* bears a close resemblance to a similar stanza of *Kiratārjuniya*[5] of Bharavi (c 600 A D) whose influence may be traced in other illustrations also of *citralamkaras* [6] The *Kāvyadarsa* s indebtedness to Bāna (c 610–50) is evidenced by the verse श्ररत्नालोक-सहार्यम श्रवार्य सूय रश्मिभि । दृष्टिरोधकर यूना यौवनप्रभव तम ॥— which is a versification of the following passage of *Kadambari* केवल च निसगत एवाभानुभेद्यम् श्ररत्नालोकोच्छेद्यम श्रदीपप्रभापनेयम श्रति गहन तमो यौवनप्रभवम् ।[7] Another verse of *Kavyadarsa*, which resembles a *sloka* of Māgha also might in fact be a reminiscence of a passage of *Kadambari* [8] Again the statement in the work that irregularity is noticed with regard to the narrator in *akhyayikas* where persons other than the hero are observed to have narrated the tale seems to point to the *Harsacarita* where

1 KA II 226 362 cp Caru I 19 Balac I 15 also cp Mrcch I 34 (see ch II)

2 KA II 280 cp Sylvain Levi JA (1923) pp 199 ff V G Paranjpe Mrcch intro p ix

3 While the ver e is absent in the drama it has been traced in *Madālasā* by the comm Premacandra Tarkavagisa cp Agashe *op cit* pp liv lv

4 Cp KA I 45 with Śak I 20 II 129 with Śāk I 26 II 286 with *Ragh VIII* 57 see App VI cp Keith ISHL pp 182-4 De HSP I p 61 and fn Taruna on KA I 2 remarks that Dandin consulted the usages of poets like Kalidasa

5 Cp KA III 95 with Kir XV 14 for ref to Bhāravi in ASK see below

6 Cp *esp Kir* XV 7 29 (verses without labial letters)

7 Cp *KA II 197* Kād para 103 cp Peterson DKC Agashe ed p ix fn. Keith s assertion (ISHL pp 168–9) that Bāna may be the person ind bted is not convinc ng the opinion of Keith is evidently based on the presumption that Dand n *wrote before B*ina cp ref to Bāna and his Kād in ASK pp 3 and 20 respectively

8 Cp KA II 302 Śiś. II 4 Kād. para 85

the story of Harṣa has been related by Bāṇa and not by Harṣa himself[1] The three fold division of *karman* into *nirvartya vikārya* and *prāpya* in the *Kāvyādarśa* has been taken from the *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari (c 600–50 A D)[2] and the fact can not be explained away by saying that the work has simply adopted a current doctrine[3] As both Bāṇa and Bhartṛhari lived in the first half of seventh century A D[4] this period may be fixed as the upper terminus of the date of the *Kāvyādarśa*

The lower limit of the *Kāvyādarśa*'s date is furnished by the *Siya bas lakara* and the *Kavirājamārga* as also by the works of Bhāmaha and Vāmana *Siya bas lakara*, the Simhalese work on Rhetoric by the king Sena I or Śilameghavarṇasena, who cannot be placed in any case later than 9th century A D,[5] refers to Daṇḍin as one of its authorities and profusely draws upon his work[6] *Kavirājamārga*, the oldest extant work on Poetics in Kannada ascribed to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Amoghavarṣa Nṛpatunga (815–75 A D), adopts a good deal of matter from the *Kāvyādarśa* and exhibits its great influence throughout

---

1 Cp KA I 25 cp Hari Chand (*Kālidāsa et l'art poétique de l'Inde* p 81) who pointed out that Taruna (on KA I 25) suggested the view Keith however does not accept the suggestion (cp ISHL pp 182–4)

2 Cp KA II 240 cp Vākya III 45 f Patañjali does not divide *karman* into different varieties The comms Helārāja and Bhutirāja tell us that the division was evolved out of the *sutra* by Bhartṛhari himself and this view is confirmed by Kaiyaṭa, cp Pathak JA xli p 237 also cp De HSP I pp 61–2

3 See Keith (ISHL pp 168 9) who holds the view

4 Cp Keith HSL p 315 (for Bāṇa) and p 429 (for Bhartṛhari)

5 Acc to *Mahāvaṃśa* he reigned from 846 to 866 A D cp Barnett JRAS 1905 p 841 Acc to G C Mendis and Geiger (*Early History of Ceylon* 1947 p 50) his date is 831–51 A D Acc to Nevill however the real author of the work was Akbo VI son of Kasun III who ascended the throne in 741 A D cp Barnett *loc cit* In any way the Simhalese work is not later than 840 A D

6 Its first verse is the same as KA I 1 the second verse mentions Daṇḍin along with Kāśyapa Bhāmaha and Vāmana the 4th and 5th verses are identical with KA I 3–4 almost all the verses of KA I and II are drawn upon in the work cp Barnett *op cit* p 841, Kane HSP pp 99–100 De HSP I pp 55 ff

the work[1] Considerable time must have passed before the *Kāvyādarśa* gained so much popularity to be drawn upon richly by the Simhalese and Kannada writers Again Pratihārendurāja (c 925 A D) and Abhinavagupta (last quarter of 10th century) refer to Dandin and cite from his *Kāvyādarśa* The Apabhramśa poet, Svayambhu (between 8th and 10th century A D) expresses his indebtedness to Dandin in the introductory part of his works, *Paumacariu* and *Harivamśapurana*[2] The lower terminus can be determined more closely from the dates of Vāmana and Bhāmaha, if their relative chronological position with Dandin is settled satisfactorily While Vamana (c 780–810) is almost unanimously regarded as later than Daṇḍin,[3] there is sharp controversy on Dandin s priority to Bhamaha, and the question must needs be discussed in detail because the problem is vital on account of its great bearing on the correct determination of the date of our author

We shall examine below the internal as well as the external evidence and the arguments based thereon adduced by the scholars in support of their contentions The internal evidence consists of the following terms of reference (1) The identical or very similar verses or matter in the works of the two theorists,

---

1 At least 6 verses in the work are translations of KA II 37 39 162 214 235 323 most of the varieties of *upamā* (II 59–85) have been adopted from KA (II 14–50) the verses in ch III are mostly adaptations from KA cp K B Pathak *Kavirājamārga* 1898 intro pp 18 9 JA xli p 236 for Amoghavarṣa s date cp A S Altekar AIK pp 8–11

2. Cp *Hindi Kāvyadhārā* ed Rahula Sankrityayana pp 22 24 For his date cp Harivansh Kochhar *Apabhramśa Sāhitya* p 53

3 The theory of Kielhorn and Peterson (Agashe ed pp vii ix) that Vāmana preceded Daṇḍin has been discarded now It was based on the following grounds (i) KA II 51 is a criticism of KASV IV 2. 8 (ii) KA II 358 9 alludes to Vāmana (IV 3 11 14 31–3) and (iii) KA I 40-3 is a reflection on Vāmana I 2 9 13 These arguments do not stand a critical examination On the other hand there are several points in Vāmana which indicate an advance from Daṇḍin With regard to the theory of *rīti* which he raises to the position of the soul of poetry (I 2. 6) he shows a marked progress He also adopts some matter from Daṇḍin cp KASV I 2 11 with KA I 42 and IV 3 9 with KA II 234 cp also De HSP I p 60 fn for the date of Vāmana, cp De HSP I p 80 Kane HSP pp 146-7

(2) The closely allied matter suggesting that one author refers to, or criticises, the other (3) The impression regarding their relative position gathered from the general treatment of the subject matter and from their respective styles as also from the picture of the literary state of the age and (4) Arguments *ex silentio*

There is a good number of verses in the *Kāvyādarśa* of Daṇḍin on one hand and the *Kāvyālaṃkāra* of Bhāmaha on the other, which are either identical or very similar in phraseology [1] The verbal resemblance is so striking that the idea of its being merely accidental cannot be entertained Since the two authors were not the pioneers in the field, there is the possibility of their having drawn upon some common source In some cases, however the fact of borrowing by one author from the other seems to be more than evident But, this being admitted, scholars are not unanimous as to which of the two writers is the person indebted

One of such verses runs thus मद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते । कालेनैषा भवेत प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात्पुन ॥ The verse occurs in both the authors as an example of *preyas* [2] K P Trivedi thought that Daṇḍin was the borrower here, because, he argued while Bhāmaha quotes his authorities invariably and cites examples of his own composition as he himself claims [3] Daṇḍin does not acknowledge the source of his borrowing as in the case of *limpatīva* etc [4] But apart from the fact that Bhāmaha s text is too defective to be solely reliable and that his said claim is not fully justified [5] Bhāmaha in fact does not recognise the poetic figure *preyas*, along with some other figures, and simply refers to it as having been enumerated by others [6] We can naturally

1 See App VII

2 Cp KA II 2 6 BKAI III 5

3 BKAI II 96 cp Medhāvin II 40 85 Rāmaśarman II 19 58 Sākhavardhana II 47 Rājamitra II 45 III 10 cp Trivedi IA xlii (1913) pp 261-4

4 KA II 2 6 cp above ch II He however expresses his indebtedness in a general way to the usages of early writers cp KA I 2

5 Cp Kane HSP pp 86 109

6 See BKAI III 1-4

conclude that Bhāmaha who neither recognises nor difines the figure cites the example from some predecessor who might be Dandin in whose work we find the example in question [1]

Dandin gives the verse विजितात्मभवद्वेषिगुरुपादहतो जन । हिमापहामित्रधरैर्व्याप्त व्योमाभिनन्दति ॥ as an instance of *parihārika* riddle while Bhāmaha quotes the second line thereof (excluding *abhinandati*) as an illustration of the fault *avacaka* The verse has been specifically ascribed to Dandin by Śarngadhara, and there is no reason to doubt the attribution,[3] while its being a mere citation in Bhamaha who quotes a part of it containing no verb seems to be more probable [4]

Jacobi first held that Dandin borrowed the line हेतुश्च सूक्ष्म लेशौ च from Bhāmaha and criticised it, though he later regarded the treatment of the figures *hetu* *Suksma* and *lesa* as different reactions to an older list [5] But while there is no evidence of Dandin s borrowing Bhamaha clearly seems to have emphatically denied the earlier view of Dandin with his pointed remark that these figures do not contain *vakrokti* [6] The argument that Dandin adopted four out of the seven defects of simile from Bhamaha[7] carries little weight in view of the fact that Medhavin had already enumerated the seven faults as Bhāmaha himself points out [8] Instead, it can be more plausibly argued that Medhavin added three more defects to Dandin s list and

1 It may be noted that Danḍin (KA II 275 9) defines the figure gives two examples and connects them with the definition

2 Cp KA III 120 BKAl I 41

3 K P Trivedi (Pratāp intro pp xxviii ff) doubts the correctness of the ascription as acc to him Śarṅgadhara is not faultless in tracing stanzas to their original sources But in the present case there is no scope for doubt as the verse in question is found in KA Again his suggestion that the verse might have been borrowed by Danḍin also from some earlier source is unfounded In fact all examples of riddles appear to be Danḍin s own cp Kane HSP p 111 De (HSP I p 63) strangely enough sees here Danḍin criticising Bhāmaha

4 Cp also Keith ISHL pp 170–81

5 SBA 1922 pp 210 ff (cp KA II 235 with BKAl II 86) cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff

6 BKAl II 86 cp also Kane HSP p 113

7 Cp KA II 51 BKAl II 39

8 Cp BKAl II 40

Bhāmaha followed the former. Again, it is said that Daṇḍin's definition as well as exposition of *mahākāvya* is based on Bhāmaha's, whose several terms have been adopted *verbatim*,[1] but the matter appears to be traditional rather than designed for the first time by either of the two authors.

The argument of Jacobi that Daṇḍin's statement that all forms of literary speech are divided into two classes, namely, *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti*, is based on a similar dictum of Bhāmaha[2] has no real ground for its claim, for while in Daṇḍin, *svabhāvokti* appears as an element characterising poetic speech and enjoys a prominent place as a particular figure also, Bhāmaha does not recognise it, though he refers to it in deference to the tradition.[3] The word *svabhāvokti* occurring in the latter in the passage युक्तं वक्रस्वभावोक्त्या सर्वम् एवैतद् इष्यते does not in fact refer to the concept of *svabhāvokti*.[4]

Secondly, we shall discuss the verses which are so closely related to each other that one author seems to be referring in them to the other. In this connection it may be borne in mind that Daṇḍin seldom refers to particular views of previous theorists though he, of course, makes a general reference to former *ācāryas* and their precepts.[5] Bhāmaha, on the other hand, frequently refers to the older views,[6] many of which are traced in the *Kāvyādarśa*. Thus he says: स्वभावोक्तिरलंकार इति केचित् प्रचक्षते । अर्थस्य तदवस्थत्वं स्वभावो विहितो यथा ॥[7] These words of Bhāmaha obviously refer to Daṇḍin's view and also to his definition of the figure which is as follows: नानावस्थं पदार्थानां रूपं साक्षाद् विवृण्वती । स्वभावोक्तिश्च जातिश्चेत्याद्या सालंकृतिर्यथा ॥[8]

---

1 Cp. KA I 14-19; BKAI I 18-20: the terms *sargabandha*, *sakkarava*, etc. and the line *mantra dūta* etc. occurs in both; cp. J. Nobel, HP pp. 141-5.

2 KA II 363; BKAI I 30; cp. Jacobi, ZDMG lxiv, p. 755.

3 Cp. KA II 8-13; BKAI II 93.

4 Cp. BKAI I 30, where *vakrasvabhāvokti* means *vakrasvabhāvokti*, i.e. *vakrokti*.

5 Cp. I 2, 9; II 2, 7, 54, 300 etc.

6 Cp. I 13, 24; II 2, 6, 8, 92, 95; III 12, 55; IV 12 et.

7 BKAI II 93.

8 KA II 8.

Dandin defines the figure *udatta* as आशयस्य विभूतेर्वा यन्महत्त्वम अनुत्तमम, and illustrates it with the following verse रत्नभित्तिषु संक्रान्तै प्रतिबिम्बशतैर्वृत । ज्ञातो लङ्केश्वर कृच्छाद आञ्जनेयेन तत्त्वत ॥[1]

Bhamaha seems to have referred to this in the following words एतद एवापरेऽन्यन व्याख्यानेनान्यथा विदु । नानारत्नादियुक्त यत तत किलोदात्तम उच्यते ॥[2] The words *apare* and *kila* are significant in this connection

Again, Bhāmaha having dealt with the *alamkāras*, mentions twenty four additional figures as acknowledged by others and it is interesting to note that all these figures appear in Dandin s text many of them having been enumerated almost in the same order [3]

It is argued for Bhāmaha s priority that he treats *upama rupaka, sasamdeha ananvaya* and *utpreksāvayava* as independent figures, while Dandin includes, with express admission the first in *rupaka* next two in *upamā* and the last in *utpreksa*[4] and thus means to refer to Bhāmaha s treatment of the figures But Bhatti (1st quarter of 7th century) had already illustrated these figures separately [5] The independent status of the figures, therefore might have been traditional Again, in case of Dandin s particular reference to Bhāmaha s treatment, similar confession should have been made by Dandin regarding *anyonyopama* also which he includes in *upama* while it is treated independently as *upameyopama* by Bhamaha [6]

Now let us examine the verses which present contradictory views and appear to be directed against their counterparts in the other writer It may be remarked at the outset that while

---

1 Cp KA II 300 302

2 Cp BKAl III 12

3 Cp BKAl III 1-4 55 KA II 5-7 18 358-9 364 esp cp BKAl III 1-2 with KA II 5-6 instead of Dandin s *anyonyopamā* Bhāmaha has *upamevopamā* he refers to three varieties of *ślista* (III 1) while in Dandin it is divided into two kinds with seven more added to them (II 310-22) It appears that Bhāmaha adopts the list of figures from many predecessors Dandin being one of them

4 Cp BKAl III 35 43 45 47 KA II 358-9

5 Cp *Jayamangalā* on X 61 68 70 for his date cp Keith HSL p 116

6 Cp KA II 18 BKAl III 37 cp Kane HSP p 110

Daṇḍin does not name any predecessor, Bhāmaha does so and sometimes refers to them deridingly as *sudhiyaḥ sumedhasaḥ* (wise men), *mahatmabhiḥ* (great men) etc, and once as *amedhasaḥ* (unwise)[1]

1 According to Jacobi S K De and some other scholars, Daṇḍin does not accept Bhāmaha's distinction of *katha* and *akhyayika* and apparently quotes in this connection the following half verse from Bhamaha कन्याहरणसङ्ग्रामविप्रलम्भोदयादयः ।[2] K P Trivedi stressed the point that the marks of distinction between the two species specifically denied by Daṇḍin were precisely the same as those enumerated by Bhamaha[3] J Nobel thought that Daṇḍin here rejected Bhamaha's views regarding language also and that the words *samskṛtena ca*, which are ironical according to him, could be fully understood only when they were compared with those of Bhāmaha[4] But the fact that the distinction between the two species was traditional[5] and that the points of the alleged attack by Daṇḍin do not agree in all details with Bhāmaha's views[6] stands against the hypothesis of Daṇḍin's borrowing from Bhāmaha Nor can we see, with Nobel irony in Daṇḍin's simple words *samskṛtena ca*

2 Daṇḍin illustrates the (*jñāpaka-*) *hetu* by the half verse, गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिणः ।, with the remark that the example is good[7] Bhāmaha cites the illustration under the

---

1 Cp BKAI I 31 II 1 6 37 III 4 etc cp *amedhasaḥ* in I 32

2 KA I 29 BKAI I 27 also cp KA I 23-9 BKAI I 2a 9 cp Jacobi SBA 1922, p 215 De HSP I p 65 also cp Nobel and Trivedi referred to below

3 IA xlii 1913) pp 261-4 for the view also cp Devendranath Sharma his ed of BKAI intro pp 27 30

4 Cp KA I 38 BKAI I 28 cp Nobel FIP pp 160-3

5 Trivedi (Pratap intro xxviii ff) himself admits the fact on the indication of the word *kila* in KA I 23 Bāṇa distinguishes between the two species he designates Hcar as an *akhyayika* and Kād as a *katha* The writers who preceded Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha may also be presumed to have made the distinction cp pt II

6 The point about the narrator in a *katha* in KA I 24 is not exactly the view held by Bhāmaha (BKAI I 29 see below pt II ch II for detail cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff also Kane HSP pp 105 7

7 KA II 244

same figure and characterising it as bad poetry, calls it *vartta* (a form of conversation)[1] According to K P Trivedi and S K De Dandin here levels his remarks against Bhāmaha[2] But in fact there is nothing to indicate that Dandin is dealing with Bhāmaha the case rather seems to be just opposite It is also possible that the half verse was traditional[3] and was cited independently by both the writers

3 Bhāmaha enumerates eleven *dosas* while in Daṇḍin, we find mention of ten *dosas* (which are identical with the first ten of Bhamaha) followed by the remark that the discussion whether the *pratijñahetudrstantahani* (the eleventh *dosa* in Bhāmaha s list) constitutes a defect or not is dry and futile[4] Jacobi contended here that Bhamaha interested as he was in logical matters invented this eleventh *dosa*[5] Following him S K De thought that Dandin s remarks were pointed at Bhamaha s and K P Trivedi regarded this as an almost conclusive evidence in favour of Bhamaha s priority[6] But it appears that some earlier theorist propounded this eleventh *dosa* and its admission to the list formed the subject of discussion of the day as Daṇḍin s words दोपो न वेत्यसौ विचार वक्ण imply Here Dandin s remark that the matter is not worth discussing certainly does not allude to Bhāmaha who however without referring to the current controversy simply adopts the defect According to A B Dhruva Daṇḍin s words तेनालीढेन कि फलम ironically refer to Bhamaha who says प्रथमा लीढमधव पिबन्ति कटुभेपजम in this very context because otherwise the use of the word *alidha* with *vicara* according to him would

1 BKAI II 87

2 Cp Trivedi IA xlii pp 261-4 De HSP I p 63

3 The words *iti* in Daṇḍin (II 244) and *pracakṣate* in Bhamaha (II 87) are indicative of a citation A figure named *vārttā* has been exemplified by Bhaṭṭi X 45, acc to the comm *Jayamangalā* it has been defined in Viṣṇu (III 14 11) also cp Kane *op cit* pp 108 9 The term in Daṇḍin KA I 85) means simply a dialogue

4 Cp BKAI IV 1 2 KA III 125 27 (first 3 lines are identical in both) for the *doṣa* see pt II ch V

5 Cp SBA pp 210 ff

6 Cp De HSP I p 65 Trivedi IA xlii pp 261-4

not be befittingly justified[1] But in fact there is nothing unusual in the usage *alīḍha* which has been employed here figuratively like the words *niṣṭhyūta udgīrṇa* etc noticed by Daṇḍin him self[2] Again the claim that Bhāmaha was the first to initiate discussions on logical matters in Poetics cannot stand, for even the old Bharata mentions a fault *nyāyād apeta* (want of evi dence)[3] Priority on either side, therefore cannot be established on this ground

4 According to J Nobel Daṇḍin s statement that the path of words is manifold with mutual fine distinctions (अस्त्यनेको गिरां मार्गः सूक्ष्मभेदः परस्परम्) is polemically pointed at Bhāmaha who declines to make a distinction even between the Gauḍīya and Vaidarbha paths[4] But in fact there is nothing polemic in the simple statement of Daṇḍin Nor is Nobel right in asser ting that Daṇḍin s praise of good *kāvya* and description of the body of poetry (*kāvyaśarīra*) are a refutation and correction of the views of Bhāmaha[5] and that Daṇḍin criticises Bhāmaha s statement on *pratibhā* that it is an essential condition for the composition of poetry[6] As a matter of fact, no attack is evident in these cases from either side

5 Jacobi held that Daṇḍin in his remark that some theorists regarded hyperbole (*atiśayokti*) as the most important figure sarcastically referred to the dictum of Bhāmaha with regard to *vakrokti*[7] because in Daṇḍin s view, it was the poetic excellence *samādhi* (metaphorical expression) which constituted

---

1 KA III 127 BKAI V 3 cp Dhruva BKAI (ChSS ed.) fore pp 5-6
2 Cp KA I 95 cp the word *līḍha* used figuratively with *dhairya* in DKC p 205 also *ālingitavat candra* (p 145) *kāmāghrātavā kanyakā* p 143 also cp *ālīḍha* with *artha* in DhA p 237 *duḥkhālīḍha* in Vikr IV 2 and terms like *rasāsvāda* and *rasacarvaṇā* used frequently in rhetorical works cp Kane HSP p 80
3 Cp BNS (ChSS ed) XVII 88 93 also cp the fault *pratyakṣavirodha* in Vāmana III 15 13 cp Kane HSP pp 100-1 also cp Keith ISHL pp 170-81
4 I 40 BKAI I 31 Nobel FIP p 100
5 Cp KA I 6 10 cp Nobel *op cit* pp 18 46-7
6 Cp KA I 104 105 BKAI I 5
7 Cp KA II 220 BKAI II 85 cp Jacobi SBA 1922, pp 210 ff

the essence of poetry [1] But there could be nothing sarcastic in the statement of Dandin who himself regarded *atiśayokti* as the best figure of speech [2] and his high praise of the *guna samadhi* does not stand in the way of his appreciating the figure as the best one Besides the views of the two authors on this point stand apart from each other [3]

6 S K De maintains that while Bhamaha disapproves of a tragic incident in a *mahākavya* in conformity with a similar conventional prohibition in drama, Dandin, in opposition to Bhāmaha s views welcomes the idea of the glorification of the hero by depicting his victory over his enemy [4] According to J Nobel while Bhāmaha opposes here a view of some older theorist Daṇḍin blames no one else but Bhāmaha [5] A closer examination however of the passages in question in the two authors reveals the fact of a direct attack of Bhāmaha on Dandin s doctrine for the former s words न तस्यव वध कुर्यात and मुधादौ ग्रहण स्तवे have the point only when they are taken to be directed against some predecessor who might be Daṇḍin with whose dictum his words exhibit verbal resemblance also [6]

7 Dandin recognises two broad divisions of *mārga*, namely Vaidarbha and Gauda and prefers the former which he treats at length [7] Bhāmaha makes a reference to the view rejects the distinction and denies the prominence accorded to the former [8] The evidence cannot plausibly be set aside by saying that the criticism here refers to a traditional view or a matter of common controversy, as his words गतानुगतिकन्यायान्ना-नाख्येयम भ्रमधसाम are taken to indicate,[9] because in these words, he is deriding Daṇḍin rather than some one else for blindly

---

1 KA I 100 cp below pt II
2 Cp KA II 214
3 Cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff
4 Cp BKAI I 22 3 KA I 21 2 cp De HSP I p 65 fn
5 FIP pp 146-7
6 Cp App VII also cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff Narasimhiengar JRAS 1905 pp 536-43
7 KA I 40 ff cp below pt II
8 Cp BKAI I 31 2
9 Cp De HSP I pp 64-5 for the view

following a wrong course Nor can it be argued with any force that the respective characterisation of the two *margas* has no point of contact,[1] for the views attacked by Bhāmaha are precisely the same as those held by Daṇḍin [2] And despite the fact that the two theorists view the subject from different angles of their respective lines of thought Bhāmaha s critical attitude is more than evident [3] Nobel s contention that Daṇḍin magnified the distinction between the two *margas* which in fact were radically one due to his prejudice against Bhāmaha [4] is hardly borne out by the fact, since Daṇḍin has successfully but not in a fighting mood, distinguished between the two *margas*

8 Bhāmaha criticises the view of *upamā* s threefold division into *nindopamā* *praśaṁsopamā* and *ācikhyāsopamā*, which varieties have been dealt with in the same order in the *Kāvyādarśa* and it is evident that he attacks here Daṇḍin s view [5] It is no excuse to say that Daṇḍin divides *upama* into not only three but thirty two varieties [6] because the term *tri prakāratva*, if construed properly, has a simple meaning of a connected group of three, irrespective of the total number of varieties of the figure in the work [7] Further, *the threefold division* cannot refer to Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* which has only the first two varieties and not the third [8]

---

1 See *ib* that Bhāmaha s remarks if taken to be against Daṇḍin in particular are off the mark (*loc cit*) cannot prove anything

2 Cp e g (a) Vaidarbha is different from Gauḍa (b) the former is better also cp BKAl I 32 which obviously attacks KA I 44 54 92 etc

3 Also cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff Narasimhiengar JRAS 1905 pp 536 ff

4 HP p 117 in fact Nobel has dealt with the foundations of Indian poetry with the presumption that Bhāmaha preceded Daṇḍin esp cp HP intro pp 13-7

5 Cp BKAl II 37 KA II 30-2 also cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff Pathak IA xli p 236 Kane HSP p 113

6 KA II 14 50 cp Narasimhachar IA xli p 205 De HSP I p 65 fn 5 for the view

7 *Upamā* could never have been divided into these three varieties alone It is also to be noted that Bhāmaha rejects just in the following verse (II 38) the varieties *mālopamā* etc accepted by Daṇḍin (II 42 ff)

8 Cp BNS (KSS ed.) XVII 51 2 Bharata has five varieties of *upamā* two of them being *praśaṁsā* and *nindā* (cp XVII 50

9 Bhāmaha deridingly refers to those who maintain that *ojas* is a profusion of compounds, and we notice that Daṇḍin holds the same view[1] The contention that Bhāmaha's reference might have been to some other author, since Daṇḍin's views on *mādhurya* and *prasāda* are not identical with those criticised by Bhāmaha, cannot stand, because the latter refers here to two distinct views one on *mādhurya* and *prasada* and the other on *ojas*, held by two different predecessors,[2] of whom Dandin representing the second view, might have been one

10 Bhamaha evidently makes a reference to Daṇḍin s definition of the *dosa ekartha* and illustrates the defect by a verse which bears an apparent resemblance to Daṇḍin's example[3]

11 Bhāmaha objects to the procedure of treating the *alamkāras* as distinct from the body of poetry which method we observe in Daṇḍin[4]

12 The words स्वगुणाविष्कृति कुर्याद ग्रभिजात कथ जन of Bhamaha clearly appear to be directed against Daṇḍin who makes the casual remark स्वगुणाविष्क्रिया दोपो नात्र भूतार्थशंसिन ।[5]

Now we shall discuss the question with reference to the impression gathered, about their relative position, from their respective treatment of the subject It is argued that Daṇḍin's elaboration of *yamaka* and *citralamkaras* and his division of *upama into numerous varieties* indicate his posteriority *to* Bhamaha whose treatment is brief and divisions are not minute[6] The argument however leads us to the opposite conclusion The earlier writers give preference to *yamaka* and the *citrā lamkāras* and in fact it is the later writers who disregard them[7]

---

1 Cp BKAI II 2 KA I 80

2. Cp BKAI II 1 2 where the words *sumedhasah* and *kecit* represent two different views

3 Cp KA III 135 6 with BKAI IV 12 16 cp Kane HSP p 114

4 Cp KA I 10 with BKAI I 14 cp Narasimhiengar JRAS 1905 pp 536 ff

5 Cp BKAI I 29 KA I 24 cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff

6 Cp KA III 1 124 for verbal feats and II 14-50 for 32 species of simile cp Trivedi IA xliii pp 261 ff

7 Cp Bharata (XVII 62-86) who gives 10 varieties of *yamaka* Viṣṇu also deals with its numerous varieties The later writers on the other hand, neglect these figures Udbhaṭa omits *yamaka* altogether while

Besides Daṇḍin's treatment of *anuprāsa* and *yamaka* is unsystematic, and indicates his somewhat unsettled idea of the same.[1] His elaboration of *upamā* also is rather unscientific and unmistakably represents the older tendency. On the other hand Bhāmaha's division of the figure on grammatical basis is more scientific, and later writers like Udbhaṭa and Mammaṭa follow him.[2]

J. Nobel referred to some of Daṇḍin's views, which according to him savoured of lateness. Thus he adduced the following points: (i) Daṇḍin's definition of *kāvya* (इष्टार्थव्यवच्छिन्ना पदावली) shows some progress when compared with the simple statement of Bhāmaha: शब्दार्थौ सहितौ काव्यम्, (ii) the divisions of poetry have been arranged a little better in Daṇḍin who mentions *campu* and refers to drama as *miśraka* which terms are absent in Bhāmaha, (iii) there are new points in his definition of *mahākāvya* which he describes in greater detail, (iv) Bhāmaha does not define *alaṃkāra* which has been defined for the first time by Daṇḍin, (v) Daṇḍin gives a clearer picture of *mārga* which he deals with at great length.[3] With regard to these claims it may be remarked here that there is nothing in Bhāmaha which may really indicate his precedence in time. His definition of *kāvya* certainly does not represent the older stage: it has been adopted or improved upon by much later writers.[4] Better arrangement of the divisions of *kāvya* in Daṇḍin can only give him superior credit, while the absence of certain terms in Bhāmaha can prove nothing. New points in Daṇḍin's definition of *mahākāvya* merely indicate his general tendency to elaborate the matter in hand. The fact that he defines *alaṃkāra* while Bhāmaha does not goes in favour of the former's priority and

---

Mammaṭa describes it in brief, cp. below pt. II

1 He deals with *anuprāsa* briefly in the context of *mādhuryaguṇa* (I 55-60) and deliberately leaves *yamaka* for subsequent treatment, cp. below pt. II

2 Cp. Kane HSP pp. 104-5, also see below

3 Cp. (a) KA I 10, BKAl I 16, cp. Nobel FIP pp. 78-9 (b) KA I 11-37, BKAl I 17-30, cp. FIP pp. 126-136 (c) e.g. KA I 14, cp. FIP pp. 141-5 (d) KA II 1, cp. FIP p. 83 (e) KA I 40-102, cp. FIP pp. 100-4

4 Cp. Rājaśekhara KMīm. III, Kuntaka VJ I 7, Mammaṭa KPr I 4

the word *pracakṣate* in the definition amply repudiates the view that *alamkāra* remained undefined till Daṇḍin [1] Again, in giving us a clearer picture of *marga* by elaborating it in detail, he represents his particular school of thought rather than an advanced stage

According to K C Pandey, Daṇḍin represents a more advanced school of literary criticism than Bhāmaha inasmuch as he discovers *rasa* as an important element in all poetic presentations by defining *madhurya* as the combination of such words and ideas in the composition as reveal the *rasa* while in Bhāmaha, *rasa* appears as subservient to the poetic figures like *preyas rasavat* and *urjasvin* But the term *rasa* in the context of *mādhurya* in Dandin means merely 'sweetness and does not signify the sentiment, and in *Kavyādarsa* II 275 ff where it signifies the sentiment, it is represented, as in Bhāmaha as subservient to the said figures [3]

There are a few more points which have been adduced for showing that in Dandin s age the study of Poetics was 'more advanced and fraught with greater complexity than in that of Bhamaha Thus S K. De refers to (i) their respective views on *guna vakrokti* and *alamkara* which last Dandin does not distinguish basically from *gunas* (ii) their respective order of treatment of *alamkaras* which Bhāmaha arranges in groups while Daṇḍin treats independently (iii) Daṇḍin s finer distinctions of numerous sub varieties of individual figures and (iv) their respective treatment of *yamaka upamā utpreksā ananvaya, sasamdeha upamarupaka* and *utpreksavayava* which last four Daṇḍin does not recognise as independent figures [4] These points however do not help us much in fixing the relative chronological position of the two writers Daṇḍin s conception of *alamkāra*

---

1 Bharata (BNS KM ed. XVI 41) defines *alamkāras* as ornaments of poetry

2 *Comparative Aesthetics* vol I p 502

3 See also pt II ch IV ch VIII

4 Cp HSP I p 66 fn. some points raised by D. (e g their respective views on *riti* etc.) have already been discussed while dealing with Nobel s points.

it may be said, exhibits rather an elementary stage,[1] while his independent, and not group wise, treatment of the figures also points to the same conclusion [2] Again, Daṇḍin's differentiation of various sub species of the figures may be more minute, but is certainly less accurate [3]

On the other hand, Bhāmaha's views on *guṇas* are far more advanced than those of Daṇḍin who, though showing some progress from Bharata, is still far behind Bhāmaha who is perhaps the first to reduce their number to three [4] Again, Daṇḍin s position with regard to the conception of *vakrokti* is older and more natural than Bhāmaha s viewpoint which is a precursor of the elaborate theory of *vakrokti*, later established by Kuntaka [5] Bhāmaha s rejection of certain figures on the ground that they do not contain the element of *vakrokti* consti

---

1 Daṇḍin fuses *alamkāra* with *guṇas* (cp II 3) *rasas* (II 280-92) and with *samdhi samdhyaṅga vṛtti vṛttyaṅga lakṣaṇa* etc (II 367) cp below pt II In Daṇḍin this is a clear sign of archaism which disappears in later writers The process of emancipation of Poetics from the grip of Dramaturgy is initiated by Bhāmaha rather than by Daṇḍin who treated the topic in his last ch on *kalā* cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff

2 Later writers like Rudraṭa Ruyyaka etc classify figures into different groups cp for detail K L Poddar SSI pp 103 6 see below pt II also

3 See below pt II

4 The historical process is that Bharata treats the *guṇas* as anti thesis of defects (XVII 95) and Daṇḍin improves the theory by basing his distinction of the two *mārgas* on possession or otherwise by them of the *guṇas* (I 41 2) while Bhāmaha observes vagueness in Daṇḍin s treatment of the matter and solves the problem by reducing the number of *guṇas* to three (BKAl II 1-3) This improvement on Daṇḍin is conspicuous and it is significant to note that the *Dhvanikāra* II 6 10 and most of the later writers from Mammaṭa to Jagannātha accept the new number (cp KPr VIII 68-70 SD VIII 1 RG NSP ed pp 67 9 cp below pt II It is a strong argument against Bhāmaha s priority cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff Kane HSP p 113 V Raghavan SPr pp 254 5) however is inclined to see different traditions of thought before the time of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha on which they based their observations

5 Cp KA II 363 with BKAl I 30 36 II 84 5 V 66 cp Keith ISHL pp 173-5 see below also

tutes a more developed view than the simpler stand of Daṇḍin [1] A notable innovation in Bhāmaha we find in his introducing a new topic, the training of the poet [2] which was fully recognised by Vamana Rudraṭa, Rajaśekhara and others in later period

The effort of some scholars to prove Bhāmaha s priority on the linguistic ground that the Prakrits had not been as popular in his time as in the age of Dandin,[3] is without much success because while it cannot be proved historically,[4] it presupposes a long gap between the two authors, which even those scholars who otherwise fight for Bhāmaha s priority do not admit [5] Nor is it correct to say from Dandin's silence, that the writers so familiarly known in Bhāmaha s period were totally forgotten by the time of Dandin[6] and that the heated discussions between the Buddhists and the *Brahmanas* of Bhamaha s time disappeared in the age of Daṇḍin [7] The evidence of style, too is not convincing [8]

The arguments *ex silentio* advanced by some scholars in support of their contentions do not prove much Thus to argue from Bhāmaha s silence that he is unaware of Dandin's peculiar division of *mārga* on the basis of the ten *gunas*[9] is not of much value because his reticence on the matter might well be ascribed

---

1 Cp KA II 8 235 with BKAI II 92 and II 86 cp Keith *op cit* pp 170 ff

2 Cp BKAI VI Jacobi (SBA 1922 pp 223 ff) contended that Daṇḍin dealt with the topic in his lost *Kalāpariccheda* The conjecture how ever carries little weight cp Keith ISHL pp 170 ff

3 Cp B N Sharma and B D Upadhyaya BKAI intro p 39

4 Apart from the inscriptions in Prakrit from Aśoka s time onward we know of Hāla s *Gāthāsaptaśatī* (4th cent A D) Pravarasena s *Setubandha* etc Bharata mentions various Prakrits such as Śaurasenī Māgadhī etc. cp Kane HSP pp 78-9

5 Cp Nobel FIP intro pp 13-7 De HSP I pp 49-50 67

6 Bhāmaha mentions the authors Medhāvin Rāmaśarman Śākhavardhana and Rājamitra and works like *Acyutottara* cp B N Sharma and B D Upadhyaya *op cit* pp 35-40 also cp K P Trivedi [IA xlii (1913) pp 261 ff]

7 Cp Sharma and Upadhyaya *loc cit*

8 Cp *loc cit*

9 KA I 40 ff cp De HSP I p 64

to his apathetic attitude towards the *mārgas* to which he makes a passing reference in five verses only [1] That Bhāmaha is silent with regard to Pravarasena's *Setubandha* and Guṇāḍhya's *Bṛhatkathā* which find mention in Daṇḍin cannot be taken to prove that Bhāmaha wrote before Daṇḍin for, it would amount to placing him even before Guṇāḍhya (1st century A D) and Pravarasena (5th century A D) [2]

Now we would turn to the external evidence for determining the lower limit of the *Kāvyādarśa*s date The evidence includes (i) the references of commentators and later writers on Poetics to the authors in question and (ii) an examination of their age conducted independently of their relative chronological order For Bhāmaha s priority, some scholars argue that the old writers on Poetics are referred to as *Bhāmahādayah* (Bhāmaha and others) and that he is regarded as an ancient theorist and his work is reverently called an *ākara* (a rich source) [3] K P Trivedi made a particular reference in this regard to Rudraṭa's remark भामहादिमतेन स्वर्पान्तरयास एव, where, Daṇḍin s view being the same as Bhāmaha's, Trivedi thought, he could have said दण्ड्यादिमतेन, had he regarded him as the older [4] The above argument at its best, may indicate the prominent position enjoyed by Bhāmaha in the field, but it certainly cannot prove him to be the older Rudraṭa s special reference to him where he could well refer to Daṇḍin instead, shows merely his predilection for Bhāmaha to whose line of thought he belonged It may be recalled that Namisādhu (1069 A D), a commentator on Rudraṭa begins his enumeration

---

1 BKAl I 31-5

2 Bhāmaha s priority to Pravarasena was suggested by A Anantacharya cp Rangaswami Saraswati (QJMS, XIII pp 653-4) who quotes and dismisses the suggestion T Ganapati Sastri (Svap 1912 ed intro p xxvii) suggested that Bhāmaha lived before Guṇāḍhya and that his date went back to 1st cent B C he however withdrew the suggestion in the next ed (1916) of the work

3 Cp Pratāp I 2 Ruyyaka AS p 3 and Rāghavabhaṭṭa on Śāk (p 14 Mammaṭa and Abhinavagupta et [illegible] refer to Bhāmaha with great reverence cp Trivedi IA xlii (1913) pp 251 ff

4 RKAl VIII 84 f (p 231) cp Trivedi, *loc cit*

of ancient writers with Daṇḍin,[1] and Abhinavagupta (c 980–1120 A D) and Jayaratha (13th century) refer to him as an ancient writer But in fact reference to one as an old *ācārya* cannot necessarily make one the more ancient[3] Namisādhu's reference to old writers however, is significant it has the following order Daṇḍin, Medhāvirudra and Bhāmaha[4] The fact that Medhāvin certainly preceded Bhāmaha makes one to presume that the writers have been arranged chronologically[5] The evidence of certain commentators of Daṇḍin, which seems to go in favour of Bhāmaha s priority[6] should not be relied upon in view of the enormous evidence proving his posteriority and much so because the commentators wrote much later than the disputed writers Again, as pointed out by P V Kane, it is possible that the commentators noticing controversial views, thought that Dandin has criticised Bhāmaha as we see in other analogical cases[7] The evidence of Bhoja s *Śṛṅgaraprakaśa* which contains the passage वक्रत्वम एव काव्यानां परा भषेति भामह । श्लेष पुष्णाति सर्वासु प्रायो वक्रोक्तिषु श्रियम ॥, indicating according to A Sankaran that *Kavyādarśa* cited Bhamaha,[8] is highly doubt-

1 Cp Namisadhu on RKAl I 2 He is older than all the authors mentioned by Trivedi as referring to Bhāmaha as ancient cp Kane HSP p 103

2 Cp AB on BNS VI (KM ed p 62) it may be noted that Abhinava gupta is much older than Ruyyaka who (in AS p 3) refers to Bhāmaha as *ciramtana* cp Kane HSP p 104

3 Even Udbhaṭa (c 800 A D) and Vāmana (second half of 9th cent) comparatively late writers have been included among the ancients cp Ruyyaka s AS p 3, and ŚPr X Josyer ed p 409 respectively

4 See above Medhāvin and Rudra (different from Rudraṭa cp M T Narasimiengar JRAS 1905 pp 538 ff) may be two authors

5 Bhāmaha (II 40 88) quotes him It appears that Daṇḍin Medhāvin and Rudra were almost *contemporaries while Bhāmaha followed a few* decades later

6 Cp Taruna (13th cent) on KA I 29 II 235 also cp on I 23–4 II 237 258 III 127 etc again cp Harināthа (bet 1575 and 1675 A D) on I 15 Vādijaṅghāla (later than Dhanañjaya of 974–96 A D) on I 21 Cp Narsimhachar IA xli (1912) p 91 K P Trivedi IA xlii (1913) p 264 De HSP I p 66

7 Cp Kane HSP p 105

8 Cp ŚPr (Josyer ed.) II p 433 Sankaran SALCS 1929 pp 23 ff

ful While the later half of the verse occurs in Daṇḍin's book[1] the first half is not found in any edition of the work Probably the first half or the full verse is a quotation from some predecessor of Bhoja who might have taken the later half from Daṇḍin[2] It is also possible that Bhoja has suffixed Daṇḍin's half verse to his own It may be noted that Bhoja has frequently adopted or changed Daṇḍin's verses and has prefixed or suffixed Daṇḍin's half verses to his own or to those from other sources[3]

From the above discussion, we may conclude that Bhāmaha actually knew Daṇḍin and criticised his views on certain matters We shall now examine the date of the two writers independently of their relative chronological position to check the above conclusion

J S Tripathi has recently adduced some literary and historical evidences[4] to prove that the *Kāvyādarśa* (without the spurious third chapter), which he places earlier than Bhāmaha's work,[5] was composed in c 340-50 A D His main arguments besides that of Daṇḍin's priority to Bhāmaha who lived according to him between 500 and 550 A D, are as follows

1 Daṇḍin of the *Kāvyādarśa* is different from his namesake whose three *prabandhas* (*Daśakumāracarita, Avantisundarī kathā* and *Dvisandhāna Kāvya*) were referred to by Rājaśekhara

2 Daṇḍin's predilection for the Vaidarbha *mārga* has a meaningful reference to Vākāṭaka age which was characterised by an atmosphere of great cultivation of art and literature

---

1 KA II 363
2 Cp also Kane HSP pp 79 80 also cp V Raghavan ŚPr p 116 fn
3 Cp KA II 51 in ŚPr IX (Josyer ed II p 353 KA I 3-4 in ŚPr X (II p 359 KA I 85 92 in ŚPr IX (II p 355 KA II 14 & 66 in ŚPr X II p 408 KA II 18 in ŚPr X (II p 412 KA II 93 in ŚPr X II p 413 KA I 94 100 in ŚPr XI (II p 455 KA I 15 in ŚPr XII II p 491 KA II 79 in ŚPr X (II p 358 KA II 57-65 in ŚPr XI (II p 433 KA II 232-4 in ŚPr XI (II p 435 etc At one place ŚPr X 101 II p 359 Bhoja has prefixed the half verse of Daṇḍin *Śleṣah puṣṇāti* etc (II 363) to the following half verse of unknown source [illegible] ।
4 Cp DSKI pp 479 30 see ch II for his view that KA III is spurious
5 DSKI pp 479-1? Some of the arguments of Tripathi for Daṇḍin's priority are not at all convincing

3 He refers to the *Setubandha* of Pravarasena who was the Vakataka king Pravarasena I (284-344 A D)[1]

4 His depiction of Varaha (the Boar incarnation of Viṣṇu) in the *Kāvyadarśa* represents a tradition in art anterior to that monumented by the Varāha statue of Udayagiri of c 400 A D

The arguments are obviously based on meagre and dubious evidences The first three evidences may not *necessarily* point to such an early date for the work The last evidence also can at best show that the work records an earlier tradition in art, as do, in this respect, the writer s other works, *Daśakumaracarita* and *Avantisundarikatha*, and the *Kavyādarśa* itself in the third chapter[3]

We may try to determine the age of the *Kavyadarśa* (i) by a probable reference in the work to Kañci and the Pallavas as also to a Pallava king, and (ii) by the evidence of the poetess Vijjakā Although the first evidence has not been unanimously admitted as beyond doubt and the second one is weak on account of the disputed identity and age of the above poetess they should not be wholly discarded especially in view of the fact that they accord well with the conclusion reached otherwise In the solution by the commentators of the example of the *samkhyāta* variety of riddle[4] we have a hint that the author lived in the period of the Pallavas who ruled over Kāñcī from the 4th century till about the end of 9th century A D[5] At another place there is a reference to a king Rajavarman who is identified with Narasimhavarman II who assumed the titles

1 See above we have seen that he is Pravarasena II (c 410-40 A D)

2 Cp KA I 73 also see above ch II

3 DKC p 138 ASK pp 22 27 43 75 80 108 205 242 KA III 25

4 See KA III 114 and Taruna thereon The phrase *astavarnā* occurs as pointed out by G K Sankara in the Mamandur insc of Mahendra varman I (600-30 A D) The comm Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa interprets it as *Puṇḍraka* instead of *Pallava* as pointed out by De (HSP I p 58 fn) but the solution of this modern comm (1863 A D) of Bengal (which includes ancient Puṇḍraka) cannot be relied upon

5 Cp V A Smith EHI p 482 R S Tripathi HAI pp 441-56

Rājasimha and *Kalakala*, alluded to in the *Kavyadarsa*.[1] He ruled over Kāñcī from c 680 (or 695) to 722 A D and if the evidence is admitted we may place our author towards the close of 7th century A D —a date arrived at by other evidences also

A Karnataka *poetess Vijjakā cites the last line of the* benedictory verse of the *Kavyadarsa* in the following verse नीलोत्पलदलश्यामां विज्जकां माम् अजानता । वृथैव दण्डिना प्रोक्तं सर्वशुक्ला सरस्वती ॥[2] The word *ajanata* in the humorous banter has a point only when taken to convey the idea of her conteporaneity with Dandin who on his part could not see her Vijjakā is identified with the famous Vijayamahādevī or Vijayabhaṭṭārikā of c 659 A D,[3] and her literary activities may be assigned to the later half of the 7th century A D when Dandin also wrote

1 KA II 278 9 cp *Kalakala* III 50 cp Fleet *Dynasties of Kanarese Kings* p 330 Agashe *op cit* pp lvii ff Narasimhachar IA xli p 92 For his title *Rājasimha* cp K A Nilakanta Sastri HSI (194 ed) p 153 We cannot however reject the possibility of Rājavarman being a legendary king cp De HSP I p 57) or the verse itself being a citation from some work describing the king cp Jacobi SPA XXIV p 214 On the other hand Vādijaṅghāla regards Rājavarman as a Kerala king

2 Cp Sukt IV 96 Sārng 180 etc the poetess held the sobriquet of *Sarasvati* cp Sukt IV 93

3 The queen is mentioned in Nerur Grant (of 659 A D) as *Vijaya-bhaṭṭārikā* (cp IA vii p 163) and in Kochrem plate (of id. date) as *Vijayamahādevī* (cp IA viii p 45) For her identification cp Agashe *op cit* pp lix ff Kane HSP pp 128 ff K A Nilakanta Sastri EHD pt IV p 245 De HSP I p 58) regards this Vijjakā as some later boastful poetess but he gives no reason for the view K C Chattopadhyaya (IHQ XIV p 604 rejects the identification on the ground that a queen could not have written such indecent verses as have been ascribed to Vijjakā But in fact it is the modern viewpoint which finds fault with her verses Ja a Shankar Tripathi DSKI pp 42-6 unsuccessfully tries to place her in c 340 A D considering her to be the author of *Kaum Smah tsava* which however cannot be dated earlier than 8th cent A D cp K C Chattopadhyaya s paper on the date of the work in IHQ XIV pp 58-606 Vijjakā s authorship of the *Kaumudīmahotsava* also is still an open question The only basis for ascribing this work to her is the opening sentence of the drama [illegible] ।

according to the evidence of the *Avantisundarikathā*, to which we would refer subsequently

Thus while the date of Dandin cannot be later than the first decade of 8th century A D, the said date forms the upper limit of the time of Bhamaha,[1] because he makes mention of a *Nyāsakara*[2] who is evidently Jinendrabuddhi[3] who lived about 700 A D[4] He may be placed, therefore, about 725 A D or

---

1 The theories which place him before Kalidasa (c 400) Bhatti (590-650 A D) and Bana (c 610-50) on slender grounds have been discarded now cp Kane *op cit* p 123 Keith HSL p 116 etc On the other hand, Bhamaha clearly refers to certain teachings of Dharmakirti (635-58 A D) cp his *Nyayabindu* II p 104 with BKAI V 11 III p 118 with BKAI V 28 and III p 118 with BKAI V 29 cp Jacobi SPA XXIV (1922) pp 211-2 Nobel FIP intro pp 13-7 Kane *op cit* pp 127-8 De HSP I pp 49-50

2 BKAI VI 36-7 (where he objects to *Nyasakara*'s use of Genitive compound with *trc* with the *jnāpaka vrtrahantr*)

3 Cp K B Pathak JBRAS XXIII pp 18 ff IA xli pp 233 ff Keith ISHL pp 167-8 Kane *op cit* pp 117-8 Some scholars (Narasimhachar IA xli p 91 xlii p 204 Sharma and Upadhyaya BKAI intro pp 17 ff K P Trivedi IA xlii pp 258-61) deny the reference as meant for the *Nyāsa* of Jinendrabuddhi because acc to them while it does not contain the example to which Bhāmaha takes exception there are other *Nyāsakāras* even earlier than Jinendrabuddhi (cp Trivedi *op cit* p 261) But the *Nyāsa* contains the *jnāpaka* objected to by Bhāmaha (though the example here is *bhayaśokahantr*) The authors of other *Nyāsas* could not have been meant as (a) they are not generally known as *Nyāsakāras* and (b) they do not draw a *jñāpaka* from the *sutra* of Pān (II 2 15) Besides the use of the terms *Nyāsa* and *kāra* in *Mādhavīyadhātu vrtti* is restricted to the *Kāśikāvivarana panjikā* (commonly known as *Nyāsa*) and its author Jinendrabuddhi (cp Pathak ABORI xii pp 246 ff and 388-92) cp for detail Kane HSP pp 115-9

4 The *Nyāsa* which is a comm. of Kāś of Jayāditya (who died in 661-2) may be placed c 700 A D cp Kane *op cit* p 118 It is certainly earlier than Haradatta (died 878 A D) who refers to its views cp Pathak JBRAS XXIII pp 18-30 ABORI XII pp 246-51 also cp Kane *op cit* pp 118-9 The view of V S Agrawal (HSA pp 53-4) that Kāś and *Nyāsa* belonged respectively to 4-5th and 6-7th cent is based on feeble ground, nor I S Pawate (*Structure of Aṣṭādhyāyī* intro pp 12-3) is right in identifying the authors of *Nyāsa* and *Jainendravyākaraṇa* which he places c. 450 A D

a little later but probably before 750 A D which is the lower limit of his date fixed by the evidence of the Buddhist philosopher Śāntarakṣita (c 705–62 A D) who in his *Tattvasaṃgraha* cites three verses of Bhāmaha criticising the Buddhist *apohavāda*[1] The difference therefore, between their dates seems to be of a few decades only and not of centuries, as some scholars thought[2] And thus Bhāmaha s date is the closest lower limit of the date of Daṇḍin which, on its part, serves as the nearest upper terminus of Bhāmaha s time

The question of the date of *Daśakumāracarita* also has engaged much controversy G J Agashe placed the work in 11th century A D on various grounds He argued that the work is not mentioned in the *Kavirājamārga* (815–75 A D) which profusely draws upon the *Kāvyādarśa*, in Nāgavarman s *Kāvyāvalokana* a work on Poetics (c 1150 A D) and also in other rhetorical treatises and literary compositions up to the close of 11th century A D[3] But the silence which by itself can prove nothing may well be accounted for by the probability that the *Daśakumāracarita*, in that age of artificial style, was taken as the work of a novice so that it could not gain ready recognition Again its total disregard of conventions might not have been favoured by the fastidious theorists and stylists in whose works it is not cited till a very late date[4]

The argument that the original of the Kannada and Telugu *Daśakumāracarita*, both belonging to 13th century, could only be written within the preceding two centuries at the best[5] is not at all convincing Also the fact of its late abridgements or that

1 Cp BKAl VI 17–9 cited in *Tattvasaṃgraha* (GOS ed (1926) p 219 verses 912–4 cp De HSP I p 49 Devendra Nath Sharma s plea (cp his ed of BKAl p 176) for Bhāmaha s priority to Bāṇa who according to him is indebted for his चरणीपारणायायुना स्व येप (Hear pp 192) to BKAl III 23 (नेपो हिमविरिस्व च etc) is not convincing

2 Cp Sharma and Upadhyaya BKAl intro pp 39–40, this view [illegible] support from scholars cp above also

3 Agashe op cit pp xxxvii

4 Cp De HSL p 213

5 Cp Agashe op cit pp xxxvi–xxxviii

of its influence only on very late works cannot be least emphasised. Again it is incorrect to say that the work draws upon the *Bṛhatkathāmañjarī* (11th century) or the *Kathāsaritsāgara* (1063-82 A D)[1] because the work is in fact indebted to the original *Bṛhatkathā* (not later than 4th century A D) itself. Nor can the reference to the Bhoja race in the work support Agashe's hypothesis for Kālidāsa (c 400) also uses the name Bhoja with reference to the rulers of Vidarbha.[2] Moreover, as M Collins and following his views with certain improvements V V Mirashi point out the Bhojas referred to in the *Daśakumāracarita* must be the Vākāṭakas who ruled in the Deccan from the close of the third century to the middle of 6th century A D[3]

The evidence adduced for a late date from the term *Yavana*, occurring in the work allegedly meaning Arabs or Persians[4] is not conclusive since the term is found applied to various foreigners in Sanskrit works. Again, the term *Bhilla*,[5] which is unnoticed by Amarasiṃha (c 5th century) might have occurred in the work of Guṇāḍhya. The argument based on the evidence of the state of society depicted in the work fails to prove a late date: the cock fight has already been mentioned in the *Kāmasūtra* of Vātsyāyana and *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭilya, as also in Bāṇa's *Kādambarī*.[6] The history of the betel leaf chewing

---

1 Cp Agashe, *op cit* pp xl-xliii cp below pt III ch III for detail

2 DKC p 187 cp Agashe *op cit* pp xliii ff cp Ragh V 39-40 VII 18 19 35 etc cp also MBhār Ādi 85 218 219 etc

3 Cp Collins *op cit* pp 36-7 Mirashi in ABORI XXVI p 31 for the Vākāṭakas cp R S Tripathi HAI pp 277-9

4 DKC p 120 the name *Khaniti* (*Khāna+iti*) in Bombay recension or *Asabhiti* (*Āsaf+iti*) in southern recension is supposed to be an Arabic or Persian name and the reference to watering of grape plants (p 155) is taken to support the above supposition cp Agashe *op cit* pp xliv-xlv also cp Moticandra DKC Hindi trans pref p 9 acc to him *Pāmeṣu* (p 155) is a Syrian word meaning good Jesus

5 DKC p 103 Agashe *op cit* p xlvi

6 DKC p 143 cp Kām. I 4 21 VI 1 25 Kauṭ. II 20 Kād para 85 Kālidāsa (Mālav I 15 f) refers to ram fight *(urabhrasampāta)* also cp Pañc. I 173 Agashe (*op cit* p xlvi) erroneously thinks that cock fight is mentioned for the first time in *Pālnāti Virula Bhāgavatam* (1080-7 A D)

goes back to very early period,[1] and the word *citrāstarana* is as old as the *Rāmāyana*[2] Besides, as S K De remarks the argument can be applied equally well to the *Mṛcchakaṭika* and the *Caturbhāṇī* the early age of which has unanimously been admitted and to which the *Daśakumāracarita* bears a close resemblance in spirit style and diction[3] The use of unfamiliar words grammatical solecisms and stylistic peculiarities of the work, on which stress is laid for a late date point as a matter of fact to an early period for the work The view of *Daśakumāracarita*'s indebtedness to the *Naiṣadhacarita* (12 century A D) is totally impossible, it is the latter work itself which is the borrower[4]

The impossible dating of *Daśakumāracarita* has almost been discarded now, but the equally untenable view that the work was composed in 6th century A D is still held by some scholars[5] Mark Collins assigned the work to the 6th century A D on the basis of geographical data which referred accor ding to him to a state of society that existed in a period anterior to the date of Harṣa's empire[6] Keith and De supported the view, also because according to them the romance must have been composed before the works of Subandhu and Bāṇa since it is free from the affected style and developed form of those writers As far as the evidence afforded by the geographi

1 DKC p 144 also cp CSD ch X Acc to Agashe (*op cit* p xlvi) the practice of habitually chewing betel leaf and the use of a purse *upahar tikā* for keeping its ingredients esp in the case of *brāhmaṇas* is very modern But in view of its very old history the above conjecture may be discarded The references to *tāmbūla* and its ingredients are found in Kālidāsa's works and in *Caraka Suśruta* BS (c 400 A D) etc The Mandasor insc of silk weavers (473 A D) refers to *tāmbūla* cp P K Gode SICH I pp 113 5 S S Mishra MSA pp 251 61 for detail cp also KSS para 54 Har pp 33 42 etc

2 Cp Rām IV 44 99

3 HSL p 293

4 Cp harangue of Viśrabhadra in DKC pp 190 ff with Nais XVII 37 98 (cp Agashe *op cit* pp xlvi xlvii the idea already occurs in KA III 45

5 Cp Keith HSL pp 296 7 De HSL p 299

6 Cp M Collins *op cit* pp 9 ff

cal and historical data is concerned, it does not necessarily warrant the period prior to Harṣavardhana (606-47 A D) for the composition of the work even if the data contained in it belong to 6th century A D, because the author s detailed knowledge of different kingdoms of the period may merely indicate that he lived at a time when the events were fresh and were well remembered [1] The evidence, therefore cannot come in the way of placing him in the 7th century A D on the positive evidence of the *Avantisundarikathā* And taking this evidence in view, V V Mirashi rightly concludes his discussion on the historical data of the work with the remark that the author of the romance may have flourished about a hundred years after the occurrence of the events alluded to in the work, that is, the fall of the Vākāṭakas (c 550 A D) when, in all probability, he had a fairly reliable information about the last days of the Vakāṭaka rule in Vidarbha [2] The cultural data contained in the work bear in numerous points a general resemblance to those afforded by the works of Bāna[3] who belongs to the first half of the 7th century in which, towards the close of it, we propose to place the *Dasakumaracarita*

Nor the evidence of style should present any difficulty, because the romance does not represent the literary tendency of any particular age by its style and diction which is rather exceptionally conspicuous by its unconventionality, as S K De himself admits [4] And when no period of Sanskrit literature is free from conventionality it is not fair to ascribe a particular period to a certain work on the basis of its *unconventional* style As a matter of fact the style of *Daśakumaracarita* reflects the peculiar individuality of its author rather than represents a cer tain era which may seem to be characterised by the features it displays Besides no period in the history of Sanskrit literature can with justification be said to be possessed of the peculiari ties that the present romance which is unique in its content, spirit style and diction exhibits

1 Cp V V Mirashi in ABORI XXVI p 31
2 Cp V V Mirashi *loc cit*
3 Cp CSD ch I
4 Cp HSL p 213

The evidence of the *Avantisundarīkathā* is indeed of great importance in determining within narrower limits the date of Daṇḍin because it is to a great extent conclusive and reliable [1] According to the romance Dāmodarasvāmin the great grand father of Daṇḍin secured friendship of the prince Viṣṇuvardhana through Bhāravi and a little later when he was twenty he joined the court of king Durvinīta of the Gaṅga dynasty The Pallava king Siṁhaviṣṇu who was ruling over Kāñcī at this time came to know of his poetic talent and somehow managed to get him in his court [2] This account refers to some historical figures and makes them contemporaries When we turn to history we come across the following facts

1 The Pallava ruler, Siṁhaviṣṇu the son of Siṁha varman and the virtual founder of the Pallava power ruled over Kāñcī from c 575 to c 600 A D He was a great conqueror and he inaugurated a new era both politically and culturally He was a great patron of art and literature He introduced into the Pallava society the elements of Vedic religion and culture He was a worshipper of Viṣṇu and had the title *Avanisiṁha* [4]

2 Viṣṇuvardhana (or Kubja Viṣṇuvardhana) was the son of Kīrtivarman I (c 566-7 to c 597-8) and a younger brother of Satyāśraya Pulakeśin II (reign 610 1 to 642 A D) the Cālukya king of Vātāpī (Bādāmi) He was made the crown prince early in the reign of his elder brother about 615 A D He ruled for 18 years most probably from 615 to 633 A D [5]

---

1 Even De who doubts the identity of the authors of DKC and ASK admits (IHQ III p 403) that the biographical details about Daṇḍin given in ASK may be correct

2 Cp ASK pp 9 17 ASKS I 13 63

3 As De notes (ASL p 237 fn) a poet Dāmodara [illegible] deva is quoted in the anthologies *Sūkti* [illegible] *paddhati* [illegible] and *Pa* [illegible] and also in *Bh* [illegible]

4 Cp Sathianathaier in CA pp 2[illegible] 9 R K Mookerji AI p 4[illegible] K A Nilakanta Sastri HSI 1966 ed p 142 [illegible] between 560 and 580 [illegible] *op cit* p 130

5 Cp Sathianathaier in CA pp 231-41 250 1 D C Ganguly *Eastern Calukyas* 1937 p 15 K A Nilakanta Sastri and N Venkataramanayya in HHD pt VII pp 4 1 3 would place his reign from [illegible] to 641

3 The king Durvinita of the western Gangas ruled from 540 to 600 A D [1] He was a great conqueror He had friendly relations with the Calukyas but not with the Pallavas He was a great scholar of Sanskrit and is said to have written the grammatical work *Śabdavatara* and commented on the 15th canto of *Kiratārjuniya* and also translated the Prakrit *Brhatkatha* into Sanskrit [2] He patronised Sanskrit and Kannada learning

4 Bharavi the Śaiva author of the *Kiratārjuniya* wrote before the Aihole inscription of 634 A D wherein he is mentioned along with Kalidasa and lived probably towards the close of the 6th century A D [3]

These historical facts are quite in agreement with the evidence of the romance As Damodarasvāmin through Bhāravi made friends with Visnuvardhana when the latter was a prince (*rajasunu*) it seems that the event took place during the later part of the reign of his father Kirtivarman I (c 566 7 to 597 8) and much before 615 A D when he became *yuvaraja* The meeting may be assigned to c 595 A D and as they appear to be of about the same age they might have been about twenty though Damodarasvamin was certainly below twenty At this time (i e 595 A D) Durvinita was ruling in Mysore and Simhavisnu in Kāñci It seems that Dāmodarasvāmin lived with Visnuvardhana for a short period say about a year, and at the age of twenty he lived in the court of Durvinita This event may be roughly ascribed to c 596–7 and Dāmodarasvamin's finally settling in the court of Simhavisnu may be assigned to c 597–8

Now as the story proceeds, we know the following descension of Damodarasvamin[4]

---

1 Cp Sathianathaer in CA pp 268 ff

2 K A Nilakanta Sastri in CHD pt IV pp 244–6

3 Cp IA V pp 67–71 Keith (HSL p 169) places Bhāravi about 550 A D and De (HSL p 178) also *is inclined to place him much earlier* than 634 A D in order to account for his poetic fame at that time But as Bhāravi lived in the Cālukya court to which Ravikirti of the Aihole insc (634 A D) also belonged we need not suppose that he wrote much earlier than his recognition in 634 A D

4 ASK pp 11–2 ASKS I 29–32

Dāmodarasvāmin

Siṁhaviṣṇu | Manoratha | Atilobha

(sons of Manoratha:) Dāmodara | Bhavadāsa | Siṁhaviṣṇu | Viradatta (Gaurī)

(children of Viradatta:) Several daughters | (finally) Daṇḍin

We can roughly assign the birth of Manoratha to c. 602-3 A. D., and his youngest son Viradatta might have been born about 635. Daṇḍin was the youngest child of Viradatta born after several daughters and thus his birth might have taken place about 665. At the age of seven after the investiture of sacred thread he began his studies but soon after he lost his father (c. 673-4) and in the meantime when Kāñcī was besieged by enemies he was forced to leave the capital. He wandered about different places studying in various *gurukulas* and when normalcy was restored in Kāñcī he returned home.[1]

Now we know from Garhwal plates of Vikramāditya I Calukya (655-81 A. D.) (son of Pulakesin II) dated A. D. 674 that he captured Kāñcī and destroyed the family of Narasiṁha-varman I Mahāmalla and encamped at Uragapura (Uraiyur on the bank of Kāverī) on 25th April 674. Thus the *paracakra pīḍā* referred to in the romance[2] might be identified with the Calukya invasion on Kāñcī in 673-4 A. D. When the Cālukyas were defeated[3] sometime after 674 A. D. and peace was restored in Kāñcī, Daṇḍin came back perhaps after completing his studies

---

1. Cp. ASKS I. V. in ASK th[illegible] p. 12.
2. Cp. Sat[illegible] in CA pp. [illegible] 283. Narasiṁhavarman I was the son of Mahendravarman I (c. 600 to 630) and grandson of Siṁhaviṣṇu [illegible] (c. [illegible] 600). [illegible] to Sastri HSI 1966 Ed. pp. 152 f. from [illegible] and was [illegible] by Mahendravarman II [illegible].
3. Cp. ASK p. [illegible] ASKS I. 34.
4. [illegible] Paramesvaravarman [illegible] have [illegible] Vikramāditya [illegible] take [illegible] covered by a [illegible]. It was a d[illegible] [illegible] C[illegible] R. C. Majumdar AI p. 4[illegible]

This event may be placed about 690 A D when Parameśvara varman I (670–680 or 695) son of Mahendravarman II, or Narasımhavarman II (Rājasımha) (680 or 695 722), son of Parameśvaravarman I, was the reigning king of Kāñcı [1] There was a constant conflict between the Calukyas and the Pallavas during a large part of the 7th century A D especially when Vikramāditya I Calukya ruled over Vatāpī During the reign of his son Vinayāditya (681 96), there was a lull in the conflict After his victory against Vikramāditya I Parameśvaravarman I continued to rule in Kāñcı until his death (c 695) and was succeeded by his son Narasımhavarman II (c 695 722) His reign was marked by peace and prosperity and by great literary activity Daṇḍin may have lived in the Pallava court under Parameśvaravarman and/or Narasımhavarman II, and his literary activities may be assigned roughly to the period from 680 to 720 during which his works may be placed in the following order *Dasakumaracarita* c 680 *Kavyādarsa* c 690 (when some prince might have been taught the book by him),[3] *Dvisamdhanakavya* c 700 and *Avantisundarikathā* c 715 A D

The above conclusion regarding the age of *Avantisundarikahta* is corroborated by other evidences The romance refers to Bāna and Mayūra and alludes to the former s *Kadambari* which is summarised also later in the work [4] Again it makes a veiled reference, if the conjecture of M R Kavi be correct to the king Harṣavardhana (606–47 A D)[5] The emperor

1 Cp D C Sircar in CA p 281 R K Mookerji AI pp 469–70 It may be noted in passing that the name *Rangapatākā* given by Daṇḍin to one of the wives of Śudraka is reminiscent of one of the wives of Narsimha varman II (Rājasiṁha) named Raṅgapatākā

2 Cp for detail K A Nilakanta Sastri HSI 1966 ed pp 149–53

3 The Imperative *paśya* (KA I 5 II 172) seems to support the guess

4 Cp ASK p 3 v 19 भिन्नस्तीक्ष्णमुखेनापि चित्रं बाणेन निर्व्यथः । व्याहारेषु जहौ लीलां न मयूर , where Daṇḍin also alludes to their rivalry which is attested by Padmagupta (*Navasāhasāṅkacarita* II 18) cp Keith HSL p 201 fn 4 p 20 (allusion to Kād) for Kād s summary cp ASK pp 243–6 (with beginning and end broken) ASKS V 112–49

5 ASK p 33 सुधीरा पि रिपुव्यसन हर्षेण विविग्यत acc to M R Kavi (ASK his ed intro p 13) Sudhira might be some Cālukya prince defeated by Harṣavardhana also cp ASK p 206

might have been in Daṇḍin's mind also when he composed the verse [illegible] ॥ the only stanza preserved to us from his lost *Drisam-dhāna-kāvya*.[1] It might be placed, therefore, after Harṣavardhana and his protege Bana (606–47 A. D.) to whose work it owes much and bears a close resemblance also in the matter of social and cultural data.[2]

Thus the date of the works of Daṇḍin is determined, on independent examination, to be the last quarter of the 7th and the first of the 8th century A. D., and the great writer may be assigned to the period from c. 665 to 710 or 720 A. D.

---

[1] For DSK & the verse [illegible] see above ch. II

[2] See CSD. For Bā[illegible] influence on Daṇ[illegible] see App. XII

CHAPTER IV

LIFE OF DANDIN

There are various anecdotical traditions regarding Dandin's life In one of such traditions he is represented as a contemporary of Kalidāsa and Bhavabhuti,[1] another tradition places him in the court of Bhoja and there is still another which describes his poetic rivalry with Kālidāsa[3] Beyond according a distinct recognition to the author such traditions do not help us in knowing the personality of Dandin Efforts to deduce some facts from his name *Dandin* which signifies a *brahmana* mendicant[4] are of no value, for such conjectures lack corrobora tive evidence And the fact that Dandin was his name and not the title is ascertained beyond doubt by the biographical evidence of the *Avantisundarikatha*[5] the somewhat unfamiliar appellation

---

1 A work *Kavicarıtra* has a story that these poets described Sarasvati (who manifested in the form of a damsel playing with a ball) differently Daṇḍin on his part depicting the scene in a verse reminiscent of DKC pp 151–3 and esp p 153

2 Cp Ballala s *Bhojaprabandha* which records an incident of *samasya purana* in which the *samasya* चरमगिरिनितम्ब चन्द्रबिम्ब ललम्ब was completed by Bhavabhuti Daṇḍin and Kālidasa each composing one line

3 Sarasvati is said to have given her verdict in favour of Daṇḍin on the question as to which of the two poets was a real poet though she supplemented her judgement by identifying Kalidasa with herself

4 Cp Wilson DKC intro p 4 Krishnamachariar also made a similar conjecture cp Agashe *op cit* p lxv A Rangasvami Sarasvati (QJMS XIII p 680) pointed out that acc to one of the comms the author came to be called Daṇḍin on account of the beauty of the first verse of DKC (*Brahmāṇḍa* etc) wherein the word *danda* occurs 8 times These conjectures are groundless as also the view (referred to in Agashe *op cit* p lxv) that the author was an imposter who like Chatterton in English literature attempted to pass off his work under a revered name *Daṇḍin*

5 Cp ASK pp 11–2

seems to signify Daṇḍin's being the mainstay of his family as he was born to his parents after so many daughters.

According to the work[1] the ancestors of Daṇḍin of the Kauśika *gotra* belonged to Ānandapura, a town in the North-west (in Gujarat), a crest-jewel of Āryadeśa, from where some forefather of his migrated to Acalapura, a city in the Nāsikya country. Here one Nārāyaṇasvāmin was born in this family. He got a son named Dāmodarasvāmin who, through the poet Bhāravi, befriended the Cālukya prince Viṣṇuvardhana. Once he accompanied Viṣṇuvardhana in hunting excursion and was forced to take meat. As atonement for the sin he started on a pilgrimage and in the course of his wanderings, he met the Gaṅga king Durvinīta and joined his court when he was about twenty. The Pallava king Siṃhaviṣṇu came to know of his poetic talent and invited him to his court. Dāmodarasvāmin joined his court and finally settled at Kāñcī where he composed many works like *Gandhamādana* etc. Daṇḍin, who was the great grand son of this Dāmodarasvāmin, was born to Vīradatta and Gaurī after several daughters.[2]

After the *upanayana* ceremony at the age of seven, Daṇḍin started his studies; about the same time he lost his father. Meantime Kāñcī was attacked and devastated by enemies. In confusion that followed Daṇḍin, bereft of his relatives and friends, left Kāñcī and roamed about different places, lived in famous centres of learning for long and attained knowledge. He also participated in learned discussions in the great assemblies of scholarly *Brāhmaṇas* and *Kṣatriyas*. When life became normal in Kāñcī he returned home[3] and lived a happy life. He

1. Cp. ASK pp. 9ff; ASKS I. 19ff; also cp. V. Raghavan, New Catalogus Catalogorum, vol. I, pp. [illegible]
2. For the genealogy see ch. III.
3. Cp. ASKS I. 16; this portion is lost in ASK. That the author belonged to the South is also evidenced by frequent references to southern places which, as Collins (GDRD p. 4) remarks, [illegible] than other parts of his geography. The social and religious conditions reflected in his works [illegible] the description in DKC of cock fight (pp. 141-4) which was a common diversion in South, and of [illegible] in the story of Gomini (pp. 159 ff) which [illegible] even now [illegible] KA also shows

acquired great reputation, both as a writer and connoisseur of art and literature, among the scholars poets and artists of the day[1] Among his friends were Lalitālaya, a famous architect and artist magician and poet Ranamalla, the Commander in Chief s son, Matṛdatta a Vedic scholar and poet, Devaśarman, a *brahmana* scholar Jayanta, Narāyana Bhajanānanda, Rāma śarman Vimata etc[2]

Daṇḍin was a great scholar His field of scholarship covered, besides the traditional Śastric learning, medicine with special reference to veterinary science astrology and astronomy and various arts and architecture He was specially proficient in Kautilya s *Arthasastra* and Vatsyāyana s *Kamasutra*[3] He was widely travelled in his boyhood when he was forced to leave Kāñcī he wandered about different lands, and most probably visited the northern countries also[4] This afforded him an opportunity of coming into close contact with people of all sorts, customs dresses and languages He was a keen observer who closely, and with deep curiosity[5] witnessed the multifarious facets of life which have been well reflected in his *Dasakumaracarita* and *Avantisundarikathā* as we shall see subsequently

That he was fully acquainted with the life in royal courts is amply evidenced by all his works and is fully consistent with

---

his predilection for southern places like Malaya (II 174 III 165 etc) Kāverī (III 166) Kāñci (suggested in III 114) Cola (III 166) Kalinga (III 166) etc

1 Cp ASK pp 12-7 Esp cp Lalitālaya s invitation to him to inspect the plastering done by him of the broken arm of Viṣṇu s statue

2 Cp ASK pp 12-3 14 16 17 We know of one Mātṛdatta as a comm of *Hiranyakeśiyaśrautasutra* cp M R Kavi ASK intro p 4 Rāmaśarman s identity with Bhāmaha s predecessor of the same name (II 19 58) is doubtful

3 Cp CSD ch VII Esp cp the compliments to him of Lalitālaya himself a great artist and scholar युष्मादृशा तु ग्रह्मे ड्रपरासारप्रभतिशास्त्रहृदय वेदिना क्रियदिवैतस्मिन् नपुणमपि ।

4 Cp the geographical data contained in his works much of which seems to be based on his personal knowledge see CSD ch III

5 Cp his words on seeing the lotus turning into a *Vidyādhara* अपि हि मेऽस्मिन् विषयवस्तुनि जिज्ञासया समाक्रान्तमेव हृदयम् (ASK p 17)

the data afforded by the *AvantisundarīKathā* It is also gathered from his works that he lived a happy life in affluent circumstances and saw the picture of life with its bright as well as dark sides [1]

He had an optimistic attitude towards life with liberal and cosmopolitan outlook and adventurous spirit [2] Although he believed in fate [3] he would refuse to surrender to the difficulties of life and could smile even in the midst of miseries and sorrows and sufferings He had a profound sense of wit and humour and could heartily satirise the false ways and values of life

He was a devotee of Viṣṇu from whom he received inspiration for writing his *AvantisundarīKathā*,[4] but he had a liberal attitude towards other faiths though he seems to have been somewhat prejudiced against the Jain and Buddhist sects [5]

---

1 Cp Kale DKC intro pp xv xvi see for his philosophy of life pt III ch III
2 Cp DKC pp 53 82 109 181
3 Cp DKC p 89 ASK p 10 164 193 KA II 172
4 Cp ASK p 17
5 Cp DKC p 73 etc see below also

PART II

DANDIN AS A RHETORICIAN

Daṇḍin belongs to the formative period of Sanskrit Poetics when some of the doctrines were steadily advancing towards development, some of them were trying for winning recognition and still some others were making their first appearance in conscious or sub-conscious form. As one of the earliest exponents of the poetical doctrines he richly deserves a prominent place in the history of Sanskrit Poetics. A study of his work on Poetics is imperative not only for having an insight into the beginnings and early development of the poetical theories, but also for a correct appraisal of the various doctrines which developed after him. Although we do not find in his *Kāvyādarśa* the various theories in their consummate or, in some cases, even in an advanced form, we do observe a sincere effort on his part to interpret and analyse scientifically the concepts he inherited from the earlier tradition, to give his own assessment of them with critical acumen and, above all, to make his original contribution in the form of presenting many new ideas and anticipating a number of theories which took a definite shape in the later times.

Daṇḍin has dealt with almost all the topics of the science of *Kāvya* prevalent in his time and has given one of the most elaborate treatments to some of them. We shall make in the following chapters a critical appraisal of the chief doctrines he has discussed in his work and determine thereby his place in the field of Sanskrit Poetics.

CHAPTER I

BEGINNINGS OF THEORY ON POETRY AND EARLY WRITERS ON POETICS

Although the extant works on Poetics are of comparatively late date it can be definitely asserted that the Poetics, as a discipline, had its beginnings quite in early period The fact is amply evidenced by (i) the casual references, in Vedic as well as in classical literature, to some of its concepts in the making, (ii) the origin and development of similar concepts in other disciplines, (iii) the early tradition of ornate poetry and the steady development of the *Kāvya* style, presupposing a prior existence of some theory of Poetics, and finally (iv) the oldest surviving works on Poetics including the XVII chapter of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata, the developed doctrines of which suggest their existence in crude form at an earlier period

EARLY REFERENCES TO THE THEORY ON POETRY

We shall here briefly discuss the references made to the rhetorical concepts in the making in the Vedic and earlier classical Sanskrit literature The Vedas contain an inexhaustible number of fine gems of true poetry *Ṛgveda*, the oldest of the four *Saṁhitās*, presents to us some highly poetical dialogues and discussions and possesses various elements of poetic as well as dramatic conception [1] It must be admitted, however, that there is no indication or suggestion therein of a self conscious existence of a definite theory or system, though the germs of it might have been there

The word *upamā* occurring in the *Ṛgveda*[2] simply indicates

---

1 Cp the dialogues of Yama and Yamī (X 10) of Purūravas and Urvaśī (X 95) of Saramā and Paṇis (X 108) of Viśvāmitra and rivers III 33) etc For detail regarding poetic elements in this as well as other Vedas see Kane HSP pp 326 ff B S Vyasa BSK I pp 11-3

2 Cp I 31 15 V 34 9

that the Vedic seer was familiar with the general idea of the element of similitude The effect which it made on the accent of the language cannot possibly make a case for conscious existence of the concept of poetic simile at the time, for it represents merely the grammatical aspect of the Vedic speech Again, there is no indication of the existence of a definite system of Poetics in the mention of a fresh and forceful verse in the *Rgveda* or in the distinction made between the ordinary speech and the refined one [1] The word *kāvya* in the *Rgveda* has been used in ordinary sense of wisdom or prophetic inspiration, agreeing with its derivation, and the term *gathā* also has the simple sense of a story

Nor do we have in the Brahmanas and the earlier Upanisads any evidence which may indicate the existence of a system of Poetics at the time The occurrence of the words *ākhyana*, *akhyayika* and *alamkara* in the Brāhmana, Āranyaka and Upanisadic literature[3] cannot prove anything substantial, for the technical application of the words may well be doubted in these places It is significant to note that the Vedāngas which include Grammar and Prosody into their scheme, do not know of Poetics which, again, is absent in the ancient lists of the subjects of study [4] As a matter of fact, the theory on poetry seems to have originated sometime during the long gap between the Vedic texts and the ornate works of the classical Sanskrit writers for as S K D. rightly observes there must necessarily be a long step between the unconscious employment of poetic figures and the conscious formulation of a definite theory [5]

---

1 Cp (a) I 143 1 (b) X 71 2

2 Cp (a) III 1 17 IV 3 16 The word is < *kavi* (<√ *ku* to sound) =a wise man or seer cp MW (b) VIII 6 43

3 Cp (a) ŚBr XIII 4 3 2 Ait Br VII 18 10 (b) Taitt Ā I 6 3 (c) ŚBr III 5 1 36 XIII 8 4 7 ChUp VIII 8 5

4 Cp the lists in ChUp VII 1 2. 4 Yājñ I 3 etc Rājaśekhara (c 900 A D) however speaks of a tradition acc to which Poetics constitutes the seventh Vedānga cp KMim. II (p 6)

5 HSP I p 3

EARLY GRAMMARIANS AND POETICS

The first glimpse of the theory on poetry in its rudimentary form is observed in the field of grammar which also influenced to a great extent some of the concepts of Poetics. It is noticeable that the grammatical speculations which began very early in India included in their scope an analysis of the forms of speech though of course from linguistic point of view. *Nighaṇṭu* the first important lexico grammatical work in Sanskrit enumerates twelve varieties of simile defined and illustrated in the *Nirukta* of Yāska[1] who recognises and expressly refers to the significance of the concept.[2] He employs the term *upamā* in the sense in which later rhetoricians take it defining it according to Gārgya as comparison of an object with a dissimilar one having similar attributes.[3] Again, he refers to the general rule that the standard of comparison should be superior to the object thereof though he also admits the opposite case.[4] He discusses simile with laudatory *(pūjā)* and derogatory *(kutsā)* senses which find an echo in the *praśaṁsopamā* and *nindopamā* of Bharata and Daṇḍin.[5] To the earlier twelve varieties of *upamā* in *Nighaṇṭu* Yāska adds a few more like (i) *karmopamā* (a comparison with *yathā* in respect of a common act) (ii) *bhūtopamā* (where the word *bhūta* is used) (iii) *rūpopamā* (comparison, with the word *rūpa* where the object of comparison resembles the standard in form) (iv) *siddhopamā* (comparison with *vat* with an unquestioned standard) and (v) *luptopamā* or *arthopamā* (equivalent to the metaphor of later times).[6] The elaborate discussion of the figure in him amply evidences the fact that in his time (c 8th century B C) the concept had already established itself in a somewhat developed form though in a field different from that of Poetics.

Pāṇini (5th century B. C.) the great grammarian uses

---

1 Cp Nigh III 13 Nir 1 4 III 13 & IX 6
2 Cp I 19 III 5 For further references to the concept cp III 4 IX 11 X 22, VII 12 13 31 XII 19 29
3 III 13 cp KPr X 1
4 Cp III 13
5 Cp Nr III 18 BNS XVII 51 ? KA II 35 1
6 Cp III 13 4 [illegible] rūpaka in KA II 66

perhaps for the first time, the technical terms *upamita upamana* and *sāmanyavacana*,[1] along with the general expressions like *upamā*, *aupamya* and *upamarthe*[2] He discusses, in about fifty *sutras* scattered all over his work, the influence of the concept on language in various spheres of suffixes primary and secondary derivatives and compounds, and, above all, in the accent[3] The exposition of simile in Patañjali (c. 150 B C) provides us with perhaps the nearest form of its technical conception in Poetics[4] Panini and his followers paved the way for the grammatical sub division of *upama* into direct *(śrauti)* and indirect *(arthi)* varieties, as well as the forms based on the suffixes of the primary and secondary derivatives, which we notice as early as Udbhata s time (8th century A D) Although these speculations and references of the grammarians cannot positively prove the existence of a definite system they afford an important link in the study of the origin of some of the poetic concepts inasmuch as they throw an interesting light on them in the making, and influence some of the concepts of Poetics in the course of its development also[5]

Again the Poetics is indebted to grammar for the terms *jati* (genus) *kriya* (action) *guna* (quality) and *dravya* (individual) which it frequently employs in connection with certain poetic figures and while dealing with expressive functions of words[6]

---

1 Cp (a) II 1 56 (b) II 1 55 III 1 10 2 79 4 45 etc (c) II 1 55 56 VIII 1 73 for his date cp V S Agrawal PB pp 467-80

2 Cp (a) II 3 72 (b) I 4 79 IV 2 113 (c) VIII 2 101 etc.

3 Cp De HSP I p 5 for refs Kātyāyana and Śāntanava follow Pāṇini in noting the same influence of the concept cp De *loc cit*

4 *Upamāna* acc to Patañjali (on Pāṇ I 1 55) is approximate to the *māna* and it determines the thing approximately the only difference is that it naturally lacks the charm which characterises a poetic simile (to which Udbhaṭa in KASS I 32 specifically refers)

5 It may be noted that Bhāmaha devotes one full chapter (VI) of his work to the question of grammatical correctness he also exalts the views of Pāṇini (VI 62-3) also cp Ānandavardhana (DhA I 13 *vrtti* p 138) who regards grammar as the foundation of all *vidyās* For the influence of grammar on some of the basic concepts of poetic theory relating to speech in general cp De HSP I pp 7-8 SPSA pp 1-2

6 Cp KA II 97 also II 8 323 BKAl III 25 V 6 ff VI 21 KPr II 8 f SD II 4

PHILOSOPHICAL SCHOOLS AND POETICS

The system of Poetics received inspiration from some of the doctrines of the philosophical schools also The concept, for instance of similitude implying the general idea of analogy *(upamāna)* which forms one of the evidences *(pramāṇas)*, occupies an important place in the different systems of philosophy and its influence however indirect, on the origin of poetic simile may well be presumed The idea of secondary meaning, technically termed *gauṇa* or *bhakta* or *lākṣaṇika* sense appears to have been definitely taken from the philosophical systems [1] But while the philosophical speculations may be said to have directly or indirectly influenced the course of development of some of the poetic theories they cannot perhaps be taken as the basis of a conception of Poetics in its origin because the system at the formative stage betrays no trace worth the name of a direct impact of philosophical schools and it is only the comparatively late writers who are indebted to them Daṇḍin, for instance borrows the three fold division of *karman* and four-fold classification of non existence *(abhāva)*[2] from the philosophical schools to which he is also indebted for his treatment of the fault *nyāyavirodhi*[3] Bhāmaha also was influenced by them in his treatment of the logic of poetry and the expressive functions of words But these writers in fact do not represent the system of Poetics in the making

THE EPICS AND THE EARLY INSCRIPTIONS

We come across some of the more general terms of Poetics like *kāvya nāṭaka kathā* and *ākhyāyikā* in the Epics and there after from about the second century A D onward the epigraphic records as well as the classical writings abound in frequent references to such terms The Girnar inscription of Rudradāman (150 A D)[4] mentions the division of *kāvya* into prose and verse and alludes to poetic excellences like *sphuṭa(tva) madhura(tva) kānta* and *udāra(tva)* which roughly

1 Cp D HSP I pp 9 11
2 Cp KA II [illegible]
3 KA III [illegible] also cp BKAL IV 33 4
4 Cp EI VIII p 44

correspond to *prasada mādhurya, kānti* and *udaratva* respectively of the Poetics proper The term *alamkṛta* appears here in its technical connotation of poetic embellishment In the sphere of literature, at about the same period Aśvaghoṣa refers to rules of Poetics *(kāvyadharma)* and employs the terms, *upamā rasa, hāva* and *bhava* in their technical meaning [1] He also certainly knows the figures, *utpreksa, rūpaka, yathāsamkhya* and *aprastuta prasamsa* [2] It is needless to explore the works of Kālidāsa and his successors in poetry and drama in this connection, for in the period in which they flourished, the system had already established itself in literature, and a little later, it emerges in a somewhat developed form both in theory and practice, in the writers from seventh century onward

TRADITION OF ORNATE POETRY

The tradition of ornate poetry in Sanskrit goes back at least to the time of Panini (5th century B C) who is credited with the composition of a *kāvya* named *Jambavatijaya* or *Patala vijaya* [3] After him Patañjali (c 150 B C) mentions by name three prose fictions of the *ākhyāyikā* class viz, *Vāsavadattā, Sumanottara* and *Bhaimarathi*, besides a *Vararuca kavya* (a poem by Vararuci) [4] The tradition naturally evidences the fact that the rules and devices of the art of poetry developed into a system however of elementary nature, at an early date The love of ornamentation, especially characterising the Indian mind, supplied the original motive force and the early tradition of ornate poetry brought about the development of the theory on poetry into a definite system The tradition continued

---

1 Cp *kāvyadharma* Saund XVIII 63 *upamā* Buddh I 1 *rasa ib* III 51 *hāva* and *bhava ib* IV 12

2 Cp Buddh I 76 V 26 VIII 37 XIII 65 etc. cp E. B Cowell Buddh (1893) pref pp xiii–xiv

3 Cp Rājaśekhara in Sukti and Namisādhu on RKAl II 8 also Baladeva Upadhyaya SSI pp 142–7

4 Cp on *vārttika* on Pāṇ IV 3 87 cp also De HSP I p 12 and fn Keith HSL pp 45 ff for *Vararuca kāvya* cp MBhāṣ IV 3 101 it was named *Kaṇṭhābharana* acc to the evidence of Sukti cp Baladeva Upadhyaya SSI pp 147–9

in unbroken chain and as early as the second century A. D., we meet with the literary works of Aśvaghoṣa whose style in its developed form indicates that by his time a definite poetic style had been established. The inscriptions of the period also present a somewhat mature form of style and diction, the study of which not only proves the existence of highly elaborate compositions in prose and verse written in ornate *kāvya* style during the early centuries A. D. but also attests to the fact that the writers of inscriptions were well-equipped with the rules of Sanskrit Poetics.[1] In the 4th and 5th centuries A. D., which form the creative period of Sanskrit language and literature, a highly finished style in prose and poetry made its appearance under the Gupta patronage which gave us the masterly works of Kālidāsa, along with a number of fine inscriptions. The development of Poetics must have proceeded apace, though we do not possess today the early attempts. The developed *kāvya* style of the Gupta period warrants not only a conscious existence of the theory of Poetics but also its considerable development in the age.

EVIDENCE OF THE OLDEST EXTANT WORKS

Unfortunately, the course of the early development of the theory on poetry is totally shrouded in darkness till it makes its appearance in a more or less developed form in Bharata's *Nāṭyaśāstra* which chiefly deals with Dramaturgy and refers, only incidentally, to certain important elements of poetry as means of embellishing dramatic speech in chapter XVII. Although for evident reason the treatment here of poetical theories is brief, yet the doctrines propounded herein in somewhat developed form presuppose the prior existence of the system in the making, for as S. K. De justly remarks we cannot start with the work as the absolute beginning of the science.[2]

1 Cf. IA. VIII pp. 29 ff. Ghosh's trans. of Bühler's *Die Indischen* [illegible]. The [illegible] of Rudradāman [illegible]

2 HSP I p. 17; II p. 3.

We know, but only by names, a few writers on Poetics who preceded Bharata, and we shall refer to them subsequently After Bharata it is the work of Daṇḍin in which, for the first time the different topics of Poetics have been systematically arranged and discussed A study of his work, which contains highly developed doctrines, underlines the fact that the Poetics in his time had already established itself as an independent discipline with a long and sustained tradition Thus the beginnings of Sanskrit Poetics can be traced much earlier than the existing works including those of Bharata and Daṇḍin, though it cannot be said definitely when the system actually came into being Unluckily, Bharata s date, which could be helpful to us to some extent in this matter, is indefinite He may however, be roughly assigned to first century B C,[1] and we may justly place the early attempts in the sphere of Poetics between the first century B C and first century A D

Again the form in which the system emerged in the beginning or the topics which it dealt with are unknown to us Probably it appeared in the first instance, in the form of a series of advice to the aspiring poet in his art and technique[2] and prescribed certain rules for the practical working out of poetry It might have pointed out, for instance, certain defects to be avoided and certain excellences to be attained The excellences might have included, apart from the poetic *guṇas*, certain figures of speech also as means of poetic embellishment The above contents make their self conscious appearance in the works of Bharata and Daṇḍin The term *alaṃkāra* which is applied to denote the discipline in general and the poetic figures in particular indicates the fact that Sanskrit Poetics originally began with a theory of embellishment which mainly included within its purview, the poetic figures And the presumption is strengthened by the fact that the figures of speech form the main topic of discussion in the oldest surviving works of those from Daṇḍin to Rudraṭa

1 See below for his date

2 Cp De HSP II pp 34 5 fn also cp KA I 9 III 187

It is difficult to determine in the paucity of evidence whether the formulation of theories on drama preceded those on poetry or *vice versa*. It is possible that the two systems proceeded together if not originated contemporaneously. It may be presumed however that the principles of Dramaturgy were conceived earlier than those of Poetics, for while Pāṇini is silent with regard to the *Kāvya* or *Alaṅkāra sūtra*, he does *mention the Naṭasūtras which might have represented the elementary form of Dramaturgy*.[1] Any way *the two systems* proceeded together, and inspired and influenced each other in the long course of their development.

TRADITIONS RECORDED BY PĀṆINI AND RĀJAŚEKHARA

According to an old tradition recorded by Pāṇini (5th century B. C.)[2] Kṛśāśva and Śilālin wrote some *Naṭasūtras* which are now lost to us. The tradition which is reliable beyond a grain of doubt affords us a basis for the presumption that like Bharata the authors of the *Naṭasūtras* also entered the arena of Poetics, and to some extent at least, covered the theories which are common to both the systems. The writers referred to by Pāṇini lived much before Bharata who had certainly a long line of teachers before him and drew upon them profusely.[3]

Rājaśekhara (c. 900 A. D.) while giving an account of the divine origin of the science of Poetics refers to seventeen *ācāryas* who composed separate works on its eighteen different branches, two of them being ascribed to one teacher.[4] Thus as he records Sahasrākṣa wrote on the secrets of a poet (*kavirahasya*), Uktigarbha on the science of speech (*auktika*), Suvarṇanābha on diction (*rīti*), Pracetāyana on alliteration (*anuprāsa*), Citrāṅgada on *yamaka* and *citra*, Śeṣa on verbal pun (*śabdaśleṣa*), Pulastya on *vāstava*, Aupakāyana on simile, Parāśara on hyperbole (*atiśaya*), Utathya on ideal paronomasia

1. Cf. Pāṇ. IV. 3. 110-11; cf. De, HSP I, pp. 16 [illegible]
2. Cf. IV. 3. 110-11
3. [illegible]
4. Cf. KM [illegible]

(*arthaslesa*), Kubera on the poetic figures which refer both to the word and sense (*ubhayalaṁkāra*), Kāmadeva on the amusing figures (*vainodika*), Bharata on drama, Nandikeśvara on sentiments, Dhiṣana on *dosas* Upamanyu on *gunas* and Kucumara on Upanisad like secret aspects of the science (*aupanisadika*) The legendary character of the account which contains curious names smelling of alliteration is more than evident, and there is hardly any evidence of such an early systematic study of the science divided into amazingly numerous branches which the account suggests [1] It appears that a number of names which are either mythical or imaginary have been associated with the various branches with a view to vesting them with unchallengeable authority Nevertheless, the record cannot be wholly discarded for it is highly probable that it represents partially a current tradition We know some of the names like Suvarnanabha and Kucumāra from other sources also while Bharata referred to as an authority on drama, is the well known author of the *Natyasastra* The name of Nandikeśvara mentioned as an expounder of *rasa* is associated with a number of works on Music, Erotics and histrionic art [3] It is possible that he might have written a treatise on sentiments also [4] Of other teachers recorded in the tradition nothing is known and many of them as remarked above may be fabulous figures [5]

---

1 Also cp De HSP I p 1 Kane HSP p 1

2 Cp Kām I 1 13 17 for Suvarṇanabha also cp I 5 23 II 2 23 etc It may be noted that Kucumāra is credited with the authorship of the same *aupaniṣadika* branch (of Erotics)

3 The colophon of BNS (KM ed) connects Nandin with Bharata as co-author of the section on music Rice (*Mysore and Coorg Cat* p 292) mentions a work on music called *Nandibharata* Also cp Śārṅgadeva (13th cent) in Sam I 1 17 also Kām. I 1 8 Pañcas I 13 Rati I 5 *Abhinayadarpana* a work on histrionic art is attributed to Nandikeśvara Other works ascribed to him are *Nandikeśvarmate Tālādhyāya Bharatārṇava* and *Nāṭyārṇava*

4 It may be noted here that Abhinavagupta a *rasa* theorist (AB IV) quotes Nandin s views on certain matters which are however not directly connected with *rasa* He also quotes from a work called *Nandimata* (which he identifies once with *Tandumata*) *Nandimata* has been quoted in *Bharatabhāṣya* of Nānyadeva

5 Cp also G S Rai KMIm., intro pp 23–5 also pp 275–96

WRITERS REFERRED TO IN BHARATA'S *NĀṬYAŚĀSTRA*

The *Nāṭyaśāstra* of Bharata makes a reference to a number of ancient writers Of these, Taṇḍu whom Abhinavagupta identifies with Nandin has been mentioned as the preceptor of Bharata, while Śāṇḍilya, Vātsya, Kohala, Dantila, Bādarāyaṇa and a host of others have been referred to as *Bharataputras*[1] Some of these teachers find mention elsewhere too in literature,[2] and their existence, therefore, may not be doubted Among such writers, Kāśyapa has been mentioned by Abhinavagupta as also by the commentators of Daṇḍin and the writer of the *Siyabaslakara* as an ancient *ācārya* who preceded Daṇḍin[3] Another *ācārya*, Nandisvāmin by name, finds a mention in Vādijaṅghāla's commentary on the *Kāvyādarśa*[4] He may possibly be identified with Nandin or Nandikeśvara referred to above The name of Vararuci also has been cited by many writers as an old theorist[5]

Unfortunately, we possess nothing except the names of these ancient writers, nor do we know whether they wrote on Dramaturgy or on Poetics or on both, though with regard to Kāśyapa, Nandisvāmin and Vararuci who have been referred to as Daṇḍin's predecessors by his commentators, it may plausibly be presumed that they did write on Poetics, even though they might have written on Dramaturgy also

1 I 26 ff, for Taṇḍu, also cp *Bhāvaprakāśana* III

2 Cp De HSP I, pp 21 ff, Kane HSP pp 56 7

3 Cp on BNS XXIV, p 394 AB (GOS ed) II intro p xi Hrd on KA I 2, II 7, for *Siyabaslakara* a quotation cp L D Barnett JRAS 1905 p 841 Other writers who mention him are Kallinātha (on Saṅ II 2 31) Nānyadeva, the author of Pañcasāyaka (IV 19) and the author of Agni-P (336 22) One Kāśyapa is known to Pāṇini (VIII 4 67) and a grammarian Kāśyapa is cited by Mādhava who might be some different author, cp De HSP, I, p 68

4 Cp De HSP I p 67

5 Cp *Matsya-P* (X 25) which refers to him as one versed in *Nāṭyaveda* Mārkaṇḍeya (*Prākṛtasarvasva* intro v 3) mentions him with Bharata, Kohala and Bhāmaha etc , also cp Hrd on KA I 2, II 7 The grammarian Vararuci, however, might be different

THE *NĀṬYAŚĀSTRA* OF BHARATA

Although Bharata s *Nāṭyaśāstra* is essentially a work on Dramaturgy and not on Poetics, it devotes one full chapter (XVI in KM ed and XVII in ChSS ed) to the doctrines of the latter This chapter may be taken in the absence of an independent work on Poetics of the same antiquity, to be the oldest existing work on the science It may be pointed out that the substance of Bharata s outline of Poetics is older than the earliest extant *kavya* writings at least in its material existence if not in the present form Again, it is older than the substance of the out lines of Poetics recorded by Dandin and Bhāmaha The date of the *Nāṭyaśāstra* however is uncertain and various scholars assign it to different periods ranging from second century B C to third century A D [1] Most probably it was composed in Ist century B C

We meet with a somewhat developed form of theory of Poetics in the aforesaid chapter of the *Naṭyaśāstra* which deals with the ten poetic excellences the same number of defects and thirty six *laksanas* besides four poetic figures, namely, simile metaphor *dīpaka* and *yamaka* Of the five varieties of simile the work mentions the laudatory (*praśaṁsopamā*) and dero gatory (*nindopama*) forms get acceptance in Danḍin, while the name of *kalpitopamā* lingers in Vamana [2] No varieties of metaphor and *dipaka* have been referred to The ten varieties of *yamaka* have been elaborately dealt with, most of which survive in Bhaṭṭi and Dandin at least in name, if not in gist Although Bharata relates the figures chiefly to drama (*nāṭakā śr a*), he regards them as figures of poetry as well [3] Again, h affiliates the excellences and defects to *kavya* by referring to

---

1 De (HSP I pp 28 31) assigns the presumed *sutra* text of Bharata to the last few centuries B C while the *kārikā* text followed acc to him much later Acc to Kane (HSP pp 41 ff) it cannot be assigned to a date later than about 300 A D Manomohan Ghosh concludes that the date of the work must be between 100 B C and 200 A D cp for detail Kane HSP pp 41-2 IA xlvi (1917) pp 171-83

2 Cp KA II 30-1 KASV IV 2 2

3 Cp XVII 41 43

them as *kāvyaguṇas* and *kavyadoṣas* respectively [1] Similarly, *lakṣaṇas* have been named *kavyalakṣaṇas* His treatment of these elements shows that in his time the *lakṣaṇas* were more prominent than the figures, though in later theory the position reversed

Due to his peculiar viewpoint, Bharata subordinates all these elements of poetry to the principal purpose of awakening the sentiments (*rasas*) in drama, and it is only with reference to the *rasas* that he discusses them Nevertheless, it is definite that these elements formed the main contents of Poetics in its infancy, and the age of the *Nāṭyaśastra* may be regarded as the first known period in the history of Sanskrit Poetics

THE POST BHARATA PERIOD

A wide gulf follows Bharata, till we come to the works of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha The history of this long gap is in the dark, but the fact remains that the science of Poetics made remarkable advancement during this interval which envisaged the establishment of the prominence of poetic figures and a steady decline, in importance, of the *lakṣanas* [3] Though the number of *doṣas* remained the same, notable changes followed in their appellation and conception The *gunas* retained their old names also, but their conceptions changed radically, with the consequence that they were now related to *marga* or poetic diction Thus there is a long step from Bharata to Daṇḍin in every sphere of the science and it can hardly be conceived that Daṇḍin created, with entire originality, the whole system he represents It should also be noted here that certain fundamental concepts, such as *mārga, guna, doṣa* and *vakrokti* appear

1 XVII 95 96 Although Bharata uses the word *kāvya* frequently to signify drama in this ch , he appears to make a distinction between the two cp De HSP II pp 2-3

2 Cp for detail V Raghavan SCAS pp 1-47 De HSP II pp 4-5 see below also

3 The *lakṣanas* were conceived along with *saṁdhyaṅgas* etc within the scope of poetic figures cp KA II 367 Bhāmaha and most of the later theorists have altogether left the treatment of *lakṣanas*

in Dandin without a preliminary introduction, which fact indicates that they were traditional and well known in his time The comparatively developed form and treatment of the main contents of Poetics in Dandin also signifies a long course of development that preceded him after Bharata Had the intermediary stage been preserved to us we would have closely known and fully understood the early writers like Daṇḍin and Bhamaha in the making We may, however, discern, on the suggestion of Jacobi,[1] the different stages of development of the science of Poetics in general and of poetic figures (*alamkaras*) in particular during the long gap As he pointed out Bhāmaha arranged the poetic figures in a peculiar and suggestive way which if closely examined indicates different stages in their growth Thus his first group of figures, comprising *anuprāsa yamaka, rupaka dipaka* and *upamā* which correspond to the figures of Bharata excepting *anuprasa* (which in fact is a sub division of *yamaka*) represents the first stage The second stage is exhibited in Bhāmaha s work by the next group of six figures, namely *aksepa arthantaranyasa, vyatireka, vibhāvana, samasokti* and *atisayokti* The third stage seems to be represented by the figures *hetu suksma leśa yathāsamkhya utprekṣā* and *svabhavokti* and fourth stage by the twenty four figures beginning with *preyas* and ending with *āsis* dealt with in one group in a separate chapter in Bhamaha s work[2] The development of these stages may be corroborated by the works of Bhaṭṭi, Daṇḍin and Udbhata inasmuch as they deal with the figures almost in the above order[3] though they do not divide them in groups as Bhāmaha does

---

1 *Sb der Preuss Akad* xxiv (1922) pp 220 2 cp De HSP II pp 27-31

2 Cp for the groups (1) BKAI II 4 (2) *ib* II 66 (3) *ib* II 86 88 92 (4) *ib* III 1-4

3 A comparative table of the figures of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha shows that their order of enumeration is almost the same Daṇḍin s beginning with *svabhāvokti* a figure of the third stage in Bhāmaha is purely a personal trait then follow the three figures in the same order in which they occur in Bharata Bhāmaha here deviates from the sequence by dealing with *upamā* after *rupaka* and *dipaka* Daṇḍin expressly leaves

Bhatti (c 590-610 A D) in the tenth and twelfth cantos of his *Rāvanavadha* illustrates, in all, thirty eight figures, twenty three of which tally in name as well as in order with Bhāmaha s list, with, of course a few minor variations The remaining fifteen figures correspond generally in name, though slightly vary in sequence [1] It is probable that Bhatti who was not a theorist himself made some convenient changes in order and dropped a few of them His work, therefore which supplies one of the missing links in the history of Poetics anterior to Dandin and Bhāmaha,[2] may be taken as representing the fourth stage of growth of poetic figures We do not know the writer whose work formed the basis of Bhatti's illustration of the figures, but most probably *he* belonged to a tradition which did not substantially differ from that of Dandin and Bhāmaha

Besides this unknown author, there are some other writers who are known to have written in the interval The author of the *Visnudharmottarapurāna* is one of them The date of the *Upapurāna* is uncertain, but it can be plausibly placed in the period between Bharata and Bhatti [3] for it deals with the most

---

yamaka for subsequent treatment while his *vrtti* is virtually a variety of *dīpaka* and it has been regarded as such by later theorists (see below) Then Daṇḍin has 6 figures from *ākṣepa* to *atisayokti* in the same order as they are in Bhamaha who includes them in the second group Next follow 5 more figures which form the third group in Bhamaha Here the order is slightly different in Dandin who puts *utprekṣa* in the beginning Lastly come the 23 figures of Bhamaha s last group almost in the same order with a few minor differences The figure *upameyopama* has been treated as a variety of *upama* by Daṇḍin while Bhamaha gives it independent status which it retains in later time De (HSP II pp 27 30 and fns) curiously enough remarks that by the time of Daṇḍin a large number of poetic figures had been recognised and in the time of Bhamaha (whom he places earlier than Dandin see above) the number was comparatively less and that Dandin arranges them in his own way But as we have seen Dandin s list does not vary much in order from Bhāmaha s nor the number is larger in him Udbhata following Bhamaha deals with the first three groups in chs I-III and the fourth group in chs IV-VI

1 Cp *Jayamangala* comm see for details De HSP I pp 52-6

2 HSP I pp 51 2

3 From internal evidence it cannot be placed earlier than 400 and later

of the figures of the first three stages and only a few of the fourth one[1] which may have been in the process of growth in the period in which the work was written Other authors of the intermediary period are known only by name Medhāvin is one such writer who wrote probably in the interval between Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha who refers to him twice He has also been mentioned by Rājaśekhara (c 900 A D), Ratnaśrijñāna (c 908 A D) and Namisādhu (1069 A D)[3] Another writer, Rāmaśarman who wrote *Acyutottara* probably on poetic riddles finds a mention in Bhāmaha's work as well as in the *Ratnaśri* commentary of the *Kāvyadarśa*[4] One Brahmadatta has been mentioned by Vādijanghāla a commentator of Daṇḍin, as the latter s predecessor[5] Nothing can be said definitely regarding the date of these writers who probably belong to the long gap between Bharata and Daṇḍin

There might have been a number of other writers whose names even have not come down to us Daṇḍin follows these known and unknown writers in his *Kāvyadarśa*, wherein we come across for the first time a definite scheme of Poetics more or less systematically arranged

---

than 500 A D cp R C Hazra SU I pp 147–218 also cp De HSP I pp 95–7 Kane HSP pp 69–72

1 Strangely enough it leaves such important figures as *upamā dīpaka ākṣepa* and *samāsokti* of the first three stages of the fourth group it has only 5 figures *i e śleṣa viśeṣokti nidarśana virodha* and *ananvaya*

2 BhKAl II 40 88 cp pt I ch III

3 Cp KMīm IV (p 30) Ratna on KA II 2 cp De HSP I pp 50 92 II p 30 fn Namisādhu on Rudraṭa I 2 II 2 XI 24

4 Cp BhKAl II 19 Ratna on KA II 7 Acc to ASK (p 17) Daṇḍin had a friend in one Rāmaśarman But it is difficult to identify the two

5 Cp De HSP I p 67

CHAPTER II

GENERAL RHETORICAL DOCTRINES OF DANDIN

The main contents or topics of the *Kavyādarsa* (the mirror of poetic composition) are as follows

1 Benediction, and introductory remarks I 1–9

2 Purposes and sources of poetry I 103–5, III 187

3 Definition and classification of *kāvya* I 10–39

4 The poetic dictions (*mārgas*) and their constituent excellences (*gunas*) I 40–102

5 Defects (*dosas*) III 125–185

6 Poetic figures (i) ideal figures II 1–368, (ii) verbal figures and literary feats I 55–61 (*anuprāsa*) III 1–124

7 Concluding remarks III 186–7

We propose to make a detailed study of the doctrines contained in the work with a general reference to their origin and early conception and their development in later theory in this and the following chapters

PURPOSES AND SOURCES OF POETRY

Poetry is essentially an art and its immediate purpose is to give delight, called technically the aesthetic pleasure both to the poet and the reader and the fact has been recognised by the writers of Sanskrit Poetics from the earliest period of the study,[1] though the older theorists do not pay special attention to the discussion of the topic Dandin makes a passing reference to the purposes of poetry He casually mentions delight and fame as gains of poetry to the poet and describes *mahakavya* as a poetic composition which delights the world,[3] implying thereby

1 Cp BNS I 11 116–7
2 Cp I 105 III 187
3 I 19 (*lokaranjakam*)

that the aesthetic pleasure belongs to the reader also Other early writers, too content themselves with a general reference to these objects[1] With the advancement of the study of Poetics other purposes, *viz* wealth and escape from ills from the poet s viewpoint and the supreme delight and worldly wisdom from the reader's were introduced and discussed These are sometimes summarily referred to as the attainment of the fruit of the four objects of life (*caturvarga*) namely duty (*dharma*) wealth (*artha*), pleasure (*kama*) and liberation (*mokṣa*) Daṇḍin indirectly anticipates it when he describes a *mahakāvya* as possessed of the goal of the four objects[3]

With the development of a highly elaborate scheme of Poetics which viewed everything from the standpoint of the suggestion of sentiment (*rasa dhvani*), the object of poetry was conceived with reference to the theory of *rasa* and it was theorized to create the highest form of aesthetic pleasure philo sophically termed *ananda* which was regarded as the supreme object of poetry in later poetical theory[4] It may be noted, however that the conception of this *ānanda* originally emanated from the delight (*ramana*) or pleasure (*priti*) of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha[5]

Daṇḍin also deals incidentally at the close of the first chapter of his work (I 103), with the sources of poetry or equip ments of a poet which according to him, are (i) poetic

---

1 Cp Bhāmaha (I 2) Vāmana (I 1 5) Rudraṭa (I 21-2) also cp Bhoja (SKA I 2) Bhāmaha however adds proficiency in arts and in duty wealth pleasure and final beatitude

2 Cp Mammaṭa (KPr I 2) काव्य यशसेऽर्थकृते व्यवहारविदे शिवेतरक्षतये । सद्य परनिर्वृतये कान्तासम्मिततयोपदेशयुजे ॥, Hemacandra (KAn p 2) etc

3 KA I 15 cp also BKAl I 2 21 SD I 2 etc

4 Mammaṭa (I 2 *vṛtti*) calls the highest bliss (*paranirvṛti*) the chief of all the purposes also cp DhA I 1 (*sahṛdayamanahprīti*) Loc I 1 etc see for detail N N Choudhury KTS pp 17-21

5 Cp Abhinavagupta s comm on BKAl I 2 (in DhAL I 1 (p 41) The essence of *rasa* is said to rest in this *ānanda* Mammaṭa (I 2 *vṛtti*) defines it as the bliss arising immediately after the relishing of the sentiment wherein other knowables disappear

imagination (*pratibhā*) (ii) pure and vast learning (*nirmala bahuśruta*) and (iii) assiduous application (*amanda abhiyoga*)

The poetic imagination also called *kavitva* (the creative faculty of a poet) is said to be natural or inborn [1] emanating from an antenatal capacity (*purvavāsanāguṇānubandhi*) · The later theorists term it *sakti* (poetic power) also [3] It has been generally defined as a poet's intelligence (*prajñā*) capable of fresh invention, or his imaginative capacity which brings before his mental vision things that are remote and invisible, with appropriate words to express them in poetic form [4] The second source, namely the *bahusruta* or vast learning has also been referred to as *vyutpatti* (culture) by Dandin and perhaps at his instance, by later theorists as well [5] Bhāmaha and some of the later writers undertake to give a list of arts and sciences to be studied by a poet [6] Such a list is significantly absent in Dandin's work The assiduous application (*amanda abhiyoga*) has also been referred to as labour (*srama*) and practice (*abhyāsa*) the last term having been generally accepted by the later rhetoricians [7] Hemacandra defines *abhyasa* as repeated exercise of lessons of a theorist [8]

---

1 KA I 103 105 Rudraṭa (I 16) it may be noted divides *pratibha* into *sahaja* (inborn) and *utpadya* (capable of being produced by culture or *vyutpatti*) also cp KMim IV (p 32)

2 KA I 104 also cp Vamana (I 3 16 *vrtti*) Rajasekhara (KMim IV p 32) Abhinavagupta (AB I p 346)

3 Cp Rudraṭa (I 14-5) Agni-P 337 4 and Mammaṭa (I 3)

4 Cp Abhinavagupta DhAL I 6 (p 93) RG pp 8-9 KMim IV pp 27 30 VV II 117-8 120 cp De SPSA p 39 T N Shrikantayya IHQ XIII pp 58-84 *Imagination in Sanskrit Poetics* Krishna Chaitanya SP pp 37-8

5 KA I 9 III 187 cp Rudraṭa (I 14) Agni-P (337 4) Hemacandra (KAn p 6) and Jagannatha (RG pp 9-10) Vamana (I 3 1) however calls it *vidya*

6 Cp Bhamaha (II 9) Rudraṭa (I 18) Vamana (I 3 21-2 and *vrtti*) Rajasekhara (KMim VIII, pp 92-110)

7 KA I 104 105 II 368 cp Rudraṭa (I 20) Rajasekhara (KMim IV pp 29 129) Hemacandra (KAn pp 5-9) and Jagannatha (RG p 9) Vamana (I 3 11) however has *abhiyoga*

8 Cp KAn p 9

Although Dandın recognises the supremacy of poetic ımagination he highly rates the ımportance of wide learning and constant practice or to use his own words propitiation of Sarasvati with assiduous mind and goes even to say that they may bestow some favour even on one lacking in creative faculty [1] To this view, many of his followers take exception, and vehemently reject the idea of the possibility of poetry with out poetic imagination - It may, however, be remarked here that Dandin does not appear to admit the wealth of poetry in the total absence of *pratibha* which he expresses by the synonym *kavitva* also underlining the essentiality of the poetic gift in a poet What seems to be implied is that even if the poetic gift is of mediocre grade, one may reap the harvest of poetry, of course in a lesser degree by virtue of his extensive learning and regular practice But the fault of Daṇḍin to some extent is that he has knowingly or unknowingly, harmed the cause of poetic imagination by putting undue emphasis on the other two sources

Most of the later theorists refer to the above three sources of poetry, with of course minor differences in name or in conception or with regard to their relative superiority [3] Some theorists add a few more to the list [4] though the majority of

---

1 KA I 104 न विद्यते यद्यपि पूर्ववासनागुणानुबन्धि प्रतिभानमद्भुतम् । श्रुतेन यत्नेन च वागुपासिता ध्रुव करोत्यव कमप्यनुग्रहम् ॥, also cp I 105 The standpoint of Rudraṭa who conceives *pratibhā* as capable of attainment by culture also seems to plead for the theory of turning a non poet into a poet It is totally different from the training of a poet in the art which formed a part of Sanskrit Poetics (cp De HSP II p 283–98) Daṇḍin (I 9) also tells us that the works on Poetics were aimed at training the poets also cp KA II 187 Cp Thomas Bhand. Com. Vol pp 375–6 on the *Making of Sanskrit Poet* De SPSA pp 75–6

2 Bhāmaha (I 5) sneeringly refers to this and regards *pratibhā* as the supreme equipment of a poet Later th orists mostly follow him cp Vāmana (I 3 16) Mammaṭa (I 3 ff) Jagannātha (RG p 9) etc. Ānandavardhana (DhA III 6 ff p 346) remarks that the want of learning may b compensated for by the po tic imagination but the absence of *pratibhā* soon becomes flagrant

3 Cp for detail N N Choudhury KTS pp 21–7

4 Cp Vāmana (I 3 1) who adds *loka* (worldly wisdom) *vṛddhasevā avekṣana avadhāna* etc. to the list

them retains the original number.[1] Some writers, on the other hand, regard *pratibhā* as the only equipment which, according to them, is to be refined by culture (*vyutpatti*) and practice (*abhyāsa*).[2]

DEFINITION AND CLASSIFICATION OF KĀVYA

Daṇḍin is perhaps the first known writer who gives us a definition of *kāvya*. He defines *kāvya*, or rather metaphorically its body, as a series of words characterised by agreeable sense. In this definition he apparently puts greater stress on the words which, when possessed of the intended sense (*iṣṭārtha*), constitute the body of the *kāvya*.[3] The string of words (*padāvalī*) or speech (*vāk*) manifests itself in varied poetic dictions and it is embellished with certain ornaments.[4] Again, the series of words is to be properly employed, if it means to yield the desired sense; in other words, it must avoid flaws and, at the same time, should be possessed of the poetic excellences.[5] Thus, the scope of Daṇḍin's definition of poetry is vast enough to cover, in its wider application, the fields of dictions (*mārga*), their constituent excellences (*guṇa*), the defects (*doṣa*) and, above all, the poetic figures (*alaṃkāra*). Vāmana and most of the later theorists embody these elements into their definition or exposition of *kāvya*, perhaps on the suggestion of Daṇḍin.[6]

Daṇḍin's definition reminds us of Jagannātha's apparently similar exposition of *kāvya* which, according to him, is a series of words producing some charming idea.[7] But while Daṇḍin's

---

1 Cf. Rudraṭa (I. 19), Mammaṭa (I. 3) etc.

2 Cf. Hemacandra (KAn pp. 5-9) and Jagannātha (RG pp. 9-10); cf.

3 [illegible]

the other hand, Bhāmaha (I. 16), Rudraṭa (II. 1), Kuntaka (I. 7, 16) and Mammaṭa (I. 4) etc. give equal prominence to word and sense; cf. also N. N. Chaudhuri, KAS pp. 4 ff., 37 ff.; IHQ; SPCA pp. 18-20.

4 Cf. (on dictions) KA I. 9, 40 ff. and (on ornaments) I. 10; II. 1 ff.

5 Cf. KA I. 6, 7, 8; cf. BKA I. 11.

6 Cf. Vāmana (I. 1. 1 and *vṛtti*), Mammaṭa (KPr. I. 4), Vāgbhaṭa (KAn p. 14), Hemacandra (KAn p. 16) etc.

7 RG p. 4: [illegible]; on his conception of poetry in detail, cf. IHQ HSP II, pp. 241 f.

iṣṭartha is simply agreeable or intended sense Jagannātha s *ramaṇīyartha* (charming idea) is what causes unworldly or dis interested pleasure, a fact of spiritual experience which depends upon taste formed by an unbroken chain of the contemplated objects of beauty Thus it takes into account the poetic senti ment (*rasa*) which is essentially universal and impersonal in character The definition given by Daṇḍin however, does not refer to the soul of poetry, it rather expressly restricts itself to the body thereof In fact as S K De rightly observes "the question as to what constitutes poetry or poetic charm the aesthetic fact does not arise until Vamana and the Dhvanikāra come into the field, for earlier authors like Bhāmaha (i 23) and Dandin (i 10) propose to confine themselves chiefly to what they call the *kavyasarira* or 'the body of poetry , as distinguished from its *atman* its soul or animating principle The advan tages of verbal arrangement with due regard to the expression of an agreeable sense and of clever clothing of the sense with poetical or rhetorical ornaments absorb the attention of these writers and whatever may be the theoretic basis of poetic charm it is enough if it is realised by the objective beauty of ingenious expression [1] The later theorists who regard *rasa* as the soul of poetry define *kāvya* as an arrangement of words endowed with poetic sentiment

Daṇḍin classifies *kavya*, on the basis of various factors, into numerous varieties of poetic composition On the basis of form he divides it into prose verse[3] and *misra* or a mixture of the two forms [4] The metrical variety has again been divided into two classes *vṛtta* and *jati* according as the metres employed are regulated by syllables or morns (*mātra*) respectively, while structurally it is sub divided into *muktaka* (a single verse),*kulaka*

1 Cp HSP II pp 34-6 For aesthetic problem in Sanskrit Poetics see his SPSA esp pp 16-7 33-79

2 Cp Viśvanātha (SD I [3] वाक्य रसात्मक काव्यम् I) Jagannātha (RG p 4) etc cp for detail N N Choudhury KTS pp 29 ff

3 The division is at least as old as Yāska (Nir I 9) who calls verse and prose respectively *mitākṣara* (having measured syllables) and *amitākṣara* (having unmeasured ones)

4 KA I 11 also cp Agni P 337-8 SKA II 18 Vāgbhaṭa s KAn I etc

(a group of five verses), *kosa* (unconnected verses) and *samghāta* (short poem with a story) [1] These forms are said to be included in the main variety, namely, the *mahākāvya* (extended narrative poem), also called *sargabandha* (a composition divided into cantos) The definition of *mahākāvya*, which seems to be somewhat conventional, contains the following points (i) Its preface should consist of either a blessing or a dedication or an indication of the subject matter (ii) The subject matter, be it historical or imaginary, should be good, (iii) It should be possessed of the fruit of the four objects of life (iv) It should have a skilful and noble person as its hero, his qualities as also those of his enemies should be depicted and the supremacy of the hero should be established by describing his victory over his opponents [2] (v) It should be well decorated with descriptions of cities, oceans, mountains seasons, the rise of the sun and the moon, sport in gardens and in the waters drinking love dalliance separation, marriage, the birth of a son meeting of councils embassies, army campaigns battles and the triumph of the hero (vi) It should be embellished with poetic ornaments (vii) It should be of sizable length (viii) It should be full of poetic sentiments (*rasas*) and emotions (*bhāvas*), (ix) The cantos dealing with different incidents should be metrically well formed and well jointed and should not be very lengthy Dandin cares to add that even if some of these features are absent, a *mahā kāvya* can be acceptable provided the features present are charming [3]

With fresh experiments in literature new features were added to the list of the characteristic elements of a *mahākāvya* we have, for instance the following new points up to the time of Visvanātha (i) It may contain a number of kings of one dynasty as its heroes (ii) There should be censure of the wicked and glorification of the good, (iii) There should be one metre

1 KA I 13 also cp Agni P 337 23-4 Hemacandra s KAn VIII 11-5 SD VI 314-5 329

2 Bhamaha (I 22-3) objects to this procedure on the plea that the enemies should not appear in the tale when they are not meant to pervade through the narrative

3 KA I 20

throughout the canto with a change only towards the end (iv) A canto should generally deal with one incident only, and should hint, towards the end, the incident of the following canto (v) The poem should be named after the poet or the story or the hero or some one else likewise, the cantos may be named after the happenings they relate [1]

The prose form has been normally divided into *ākhyāyikā* and *kathā*, though Daṇḍin definitely knows its other numerous species as well [2] The story in an *ākhyāyikā* is narrated by the hero himself,[3] while that in a *kathā* may by told by some one else also Again, an *ākhyāyikā* contains some verses in *vaktra* or *aparavaktra* metre and is divided into chapters called *ucchvāsas*, while these features are absent in a *katha* An *ākhyāyikā* deals with such incidents as abduction of a maiden, war among kings, separation of lovers and royal victory etc, and is marked by a peculiar sign indicative of the poet's intention [4] which points are not present in a *kathā*

Daṇḍin however does not admit the rigid distinction

---

1 Cp SD VI 315-25 also cp Devendranath Sharma intro to BKAl pp 24-7

2 Cp KA I 28 81 Agni P (337 12-20) mentions *ākhyāyikā kathā khaṇḍakathā parikathā* and *kathāli(nī)kā* Hemacandra (KAn pp 406-8) has besides these (except *kathālikā*) *ākhyāna nidarśana pravahlikā matallikā maṇikulyā bṛhatkathā sakalakathā* and *upakathā* also cp ŚPr XI Josyer ed. II pp 461 469 for a desc of these cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 608-26

3 Daṇḍin here adds that the depiction of his own virtues by the hero constitutes no blemish Bhāmaha (I 29) however rejects the idea of high born hero depicting his own merits in a *kathā* though in case of an *ākhyāyikā* he strangely enough permits the hero to speak of his glorious deeds ! Daṇḍin it appears had before him the example of *Bṛhatkathā* a *kathā* of Guṇāḍhya wherein Naravāhanadatta himself narrates his own virtues cp also Lacote (*Essai Sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā* p 282) who however suggests that Daṇḍin would have noticed that Guṇāḍhya did not observe the traditional distinction in his *Bṛhatkathā*

4 Acc to Taruṇa on KA I 30 it is some particular mark of a composition (*bandhacihna*) like the word *Śrī* at the end of cantos in Śiś or *Lakṣmī* in Kir But V Raghavan (ŚPr p 617) doubts the correctness of this interpretation

made between the two varieties which, according to him, form one class under two different designations[1] He emphatically refutes the theory of distinction on the following grounds (i) The mere fact that the narrator is the hero himself or some one else cannot form the basis of any distinction Moreover exceptions to this are observed in the *ākhyāyikas* where persons other than the heroes appear as narrators[2] (ii) Verses in the said metres, like *aryā* verses can occur in a *kathā* also (iii) It is immaterial whether the chapters are called *lambhas* or *ucchvāsas*, (iv) Themes like abduction of a maiden, battle etc are, in fact, characteristics common to all species of *kāvya*, and they occur in a *mahākavya* also, (v) The peculiar mark, said to be characterising an *akhyayikā*, cannot be a fault in the other form of prose also A little later, Bhāmaha repudiates the views of Daṇḍin on this point,[3] and the later writers generally accept the theory of differentiation between the two classes, though the marks of distinction vary in detail in different theorists We notice that new points were added to those detailed by Dandin in the definition of the two species Thus Bhāmaha adds that an *ākhyayika* should deal with facts of actual experience[4] and says that it should be written in Sanskrit, allowing other languages (Apabhramśa etc) for a *kathā*[5] After him, Rudraṭa[6] sets forth in detail the characteristics of the two species of prose composition mainly generalising the chief features of Bāna's two works According to Rudraṭa, an *akhyayika* contains in the introductory part in verse an obeisance to gods and teachers, an appreciation of great poets and their works an expression of loyalty to the ruling king and a mention of the writer's motive in composing his work,

---

1 KA I 28 तत् कथाख्यायिकेत्येका जाति संज्ञाद्वयाङ्किता ।

2 Daṇḍin probably hints here Hear an *ākhyāyikā* where the hero is not the narrator of the story cp also Taruṇa and Ratna

3 Cp BKAI I 25-9 also see above pt I ch III

4 Amara (I 6 5 7) notes this distinction and remarks that *ākhyāyikā* as distinguished from *kathā* deals with an historical story

5 BKAI I 26 28 for Bhāmaha s views cp Devendranath Sharma his ed of BKAI intro pp 27-30

6 RKAI XVI 20-30

followed by an account in prose of the writer and his lineage It is divided into chapters called *ucchvāsas* each, excepting the first, opening with two verses in *āryā* metre indicating the course of events in the chapter Again it contains, in the body of the work one or two verses, in *āryā aparavaktra, puspitagra* or *malini*, to emphasise certain important points in the story with the help of *anyokti samāsokti* or paronomasia A *kathā* according to him contains an introduction in verse with obeisance to gods and preceptors and a brief account of the writer s lineage The story in it begins with a description of some city or the like The main story may evolve out of some other tale The erotic sentiment predominates in the story which culminates in winning over a maiden by the hero A *kathā* composed in Sanskrit should be in prose, while that written in Prakrit etc could be in verse also In later theory, Visvanātha notices, as new points in a *kathā*, a mention of the nature of the wicked people in the introduction and occurrence of verses in *vaktra* and *aparavaktra* metres [1] Although Dandin was not followed by later theorists in his contention the fact remains that his viewpoint was, to a great extent, logical and sound for it is futile to make distinctions, in the matter of literary form on the basis of minor details with regard to the nature of the introduction the occurrence of verses in particular metre or the naming of chapter [2]

The *misra* or mixed variety of *kāvya*[3] includes drama (*naṭaka*) etc for the elaborate treatment of which Daṇḍin refers his readers to other specialised works Although drama was considered even by Daṇḍin and other early theorists to be a division of *kavya* the study of its theories formed a separate discipline in older times [4] In later theories, however, Dramaturgy

1 SD VI 332-6

2 Ratna on I 28 recognises the fact

3 This variety (with regard to form as well as language) is not admitted by Bhāmaha who however mentions *abhineyārtha* signifying *nāṭaka* as one of the 5 forms of *kāvya* (I 18 24)

4 Cp the existence of *Naṭasutras* in Pāṇini s time and Bharata s work also cp ref in early writers (KA I 31 BKAI I 24) to specialised works for the treatment of drama

formed a part of the system of Poetics though we have in later period works which exclusively deal with drama Among the *misra* forms Dandin mentions *campu* also which is composed in prose interspersed with verses here and there [1]

The medium of expression forms the basis of another classification which divides *kāvya* into four sets namely Sanskrit (which he calls divine speech) Prakrit Apabhramśa and *misra* Of Prakrit, Dandin notices various forms *viz* Mahārāstri, Śauraseni, Gaudi and Latī as also Paisāci (referred to as *bhuta bhāsā*), the first of which is typified as the best He divides the Prakrit vocables into *tadbhava* (loan words assuming a different form) *tatsama* (those in identical form) and *desin* (local words) By Apabhramśa, Dandin means the language of the *Ābhiras* and others in *kavya* as distinguished from the scientific writings (*sāstras*) where it is the name given to all languages other than Sanskrit

The effect of combining these two principles gives us numerous forms of composition like *sargabandha* etc in Sanskrit, *skandhaka* (a poem written in *skandhaka* metre) etc in Prakrit *āsāra* (a poem in *asāra* metre)[3] in Apabhramśa, and *nāṭaka* where different languages are employed, in the *miśra* [4] While these species are composed in the specified languages noted against each, the prose variety or *kathā*, which, according to him, includes *akhyayikā* and other prose forms, may be written in Sanskrit or in any spoken language including Bhutabhāṣā (the dialect of the *Pisacas* or the forest tribes) in which as he

1 KA I 31 cp Hemacandra s KAn VIII 9 Vagbhaṭa s KAn I SD VI 336 for a detailed exposition of this form cp C N Tripathi CAAA pp 27–56

2 Acc to Taruṇa (on I 37) it is a poem written in *aryagiti* ŚPr (XI Josyer ed II p 474) mentions it as a *matra* metre

3 Acc to Hrd (on I 37) chapters of an Apabhramśa composition are called *osaras* (v 1 for *āsara*) ŚPr XI Josyer ed II p 480 which cites Danḍin s verse (KA I 37) has *avaskandha* for *āsara*

4 De (HSP II p 77 fn) thinks that it refers to what is now called Hybrid Sanskrit or mixed Sanskrit but it probably refers to the employment of various Prakrits in drama

points out, *Bṛhatkatha* is said to have been composed.[1] Daṇḍin also refers to the traditional division of *kāvya* into *prekṣya* and *sravya* according as it is enjoyable either through a spectacle or by hearing or reading. The former includes dramatic performances like *lasya* (a female dance representing erotic sentiment), *chalita(ka)* (a dance with erotic and heroic sentiments),[2] *śalya* (a dance in which the dancer puts his or her hand on the fore head)[3] and others, the latter variety (*śravya*) signifies all other forms of composition.

These speculations constitute the common stock in trade of Sanskrit Poetics and are found repeated, in almost similar form, in most writers irrespective of the school or tradition to which they belong.

---

1 Acc to Bhāmaha (I 28) an *ākhyāyikā* is written in Sanskrit while a *kathā* either in Sanskrit or in Apabhraṁśa.

2 It seems to be a female dance with erotic sentiment cp Mālav I 3 f.

3 Acc to Bhoja (SKA II 143 ff ŚPr X Josyer ed. II p 382) it is a *kinnara* dance with erotic and heroic sentiments. Could it be compared to *śamyā* of Bhāmaha (I 24) and Hemacandra (KAn VIII)? In fact these are the varieties of dance. It appears that Daṇḍin means by *prekṣya* a dance performance and not necessarily drama which however may contain these items. Significantly he does not mention here drama which is probably intended to be included in *śravya* (cp I 39) though generally it is conceived as a *prekṣyārtha*.

CHAPTER III

THE *MĀRGA* THEORY OF DANDIN

ORIGIN OF THE DOCTRINE OF *MĀRGA*

Before discussing Dandin s conception and exposition of the poetic diction (*mārga*), it would be proper to go into the question as to when and how the doctrine of *mārga* came into being and what was the contribution of the earliest theorists towards its evolution

Although Bharata mentions, and briefly discusses, poetic excellences (*gunas*) which in later theory constituted the poetic diction he is not at all acquainted with the theory of poetic diction as such He of course, refers to the concept of *pravṛtti*[1] which bears a partial resemblance to the conception of *mārga* or *riti*, but it is certainly a long step from *pravṛtti* to *rīti* *Pravṛttis* according to Bharata, signify the various manners with regard to the costume language and social usages and practices prevalent in different regions Evidently, the circle of these *pravṛttis* is much wider than the restricted scope of the poetic dictions It may, however, be justly said that the older theorists probably drew inspiration from Bharata s *pravṛttis* in giving names to their *mārgas* or *ritis* A similar inspiration might have come from the same writer's four dramatic manners (*vṛttis*), namely, Bhāratī Sāttvati Kaiśiki and Ārabhatī named after the localities or peoples to which they were considered to have belonged [2]

Much before Bharata s time, we notice Yaska (c 8th century B C) discussing the varying manners of different localities with regard to the usage of certain words He refers,

---

1 Cp BNS VI 25-6 XIV 36 ff KM ed XIII

Cp BNS XX 1-71 also cp V S Agrawal HSA p 34 for their affiliation to the localities respectively of Bharatas (Kurukṣetra) Sattvatas (Gujarat) Kaiśika (Krathakaisika or Vidarbha) and Ārabhaṭas (prob Arabitae to the South of Baloochistan)

for instance, to the different uses of $\sqrt{sar}$; its verbal forms are used in Kāmboja country or the northern region while its derivatives are employed among the Āryas or the Easterners.[1] Thus he alludes here to the Northern and Eastern manners with reference to the employment of words. This is perhaps the oldest allusion to various trends prevalent in different regions with regard to diction in its general sense. After Yāska, we notice such references to various manners in Patañjali (c. 150 B. C.). His mention of the Southerners as fond of secondary derivatives (*taddhitas*)[2] is important for herein we find an old echo of Rājaśekhara's similar observation regarding the people of different localities.[3] In Yāska and Patañjali, in fact, the theory of literary diction makes its sub-conscious appearance at least in its crude form.

After Bharata, the earliest known reference to the literary *margas* we find in Bana who casually mentions various literary manners prevalent in different localities *viz.* abundance of *śleṣa* or *double entendre* prevailing in the northern region, predominance of sense (over the word) in the western land, frequent play of fancy (*utprekṣā*) in the southern country and verbosity (*akṣaraḍambara*) in the Gauḍa (eastern) locality.[4] From the recognition of the eastern diction as Gauḍa *mārga*, which is definitely proved by Bana's reference, it appears that there was optional naming after the localities also side by side with the more general terms based on different quarters. In Daṇḍin we notice the more comprehensive terms *dakṣiṇātya* and *paurastya*[5] besides the regional designations Vaidarbha and Gauḍa for them. The southern diction seems to be known as Vaidarbha *marga* from the earliest time, while the northern and western dictions were perhaps called Pañcālī and Āvantī respectively, since these terms appear as early as Bharata, though in his work they denote the different *pravṛttis*.

An examination of the literary tendencies of the different

1 Cp Nir II 2
2 Cp MBhāṣ *āhnika* I
3 Cp KMīm. VI (pp 47-8)
4 Cp Hcar intro v 7
5 Cp (a) KA I 60 80 (b) I 40 83

quarters as noticed by Bāna shows that the basic elements of the classification of *mārgas* had not yet been definitely established in his time, though it is possible that the poetic figures and excellences vaguely determined the basis for their division. Whether Bana s *slesa* which he gives as a characteristic of the northern diction forms a poetic excellence or a figure cannot be said definitely Probably, Bāṇa meant to denote both the meanings, though his inclination must have been towards the figure, *slesa* (pun),[1] since he was evidently fond of its employment in *kāvya* Till the time of Dandin, the term *śleṣa* was used to signify both the senses, that of the paronomasia as well as of the excellence of that name It was only after him that it was dropped from the list of *gunas* and its signification came to be restricted only to the figure of that nomination The prominence of sense (*arthagaurava*) referred to by Bāna as a characteristic feature of the western diction probably represents the excellence *udaratva* of Bharata The other two elements, namely, *utpreksā* and *akṣaradambara*[3] mentioned by Bāna as characterising the southern and eastern paths respectively belong definitely to the sphere of poetic figures It may be remarked that Bāna hardly meant or professed to give an exhaustive list of the constituent elements of the different poetic manners referred to by him [4] He was naturally satisfied with a casual reference to the predominating elements, one each of the four dictions or literary manners It is also possible that the ascription of certain characteristics to the various *mārgas* represented his purely individual thinking and viewpoint and was not derived from or inspired by any literary tradition

---

1 Also cp Hcar intro v 8 Kād intro v 9 Vas intro v 13

2 Also cp Hcar intro v 8 Kād. intro v 9 for Bharata s *guna* see below

3 Cp also KA I 50 (*arthālamkāradambara*) also cp Hcar intro v 8 (*vikaṭākṣarabandha*) Bhoja (SKA I 70) calls the latter by the term *audāryaguna* on the line of Vāmana s dictum विकटत्वमुदारता (III 1 23)

4 Bāṇa (Hcar intro v 8) casually refers to some other elements also *viz*, *agrāmyā jāti* (decent natural description) and *sphuṭa rasa* (fully manifest sentiment)

THE TERMS *MĀRGA* AND *RĪTI*

It is uncertain whether or not the term *mārga* or its equivalents *vartman* and *paddhati* existed in their technical application in Bana s time but half a century after him, Daṇḍin frequently employs the terms in his *Kavyādarśa*[1] And it is remarkable that he nowhere defines the concept which fact indicates that he received the term with clear denotation from well known tradition, so that he did not realise the necessity of defining it The definition of the concept was given for the first time by Vamana who called it *riti* and described it as a peculiar arrangement of *padas* or words The term *riti* is conspicuous by its absence in Dandin, while it won wide popu larity after him, following an elaborate and forceful exposition of it in the work of Vamana who is called, on that count, the founder of the *riti* school After him, Ānandavardhana defined *riti* as a well formed sequence of words (*padasamghaṭanā*) which is a concise form of Vāmana s definition As he was a *rasa* theorist, he regarded it as a means of adding charm to the poetic sentiment[3] while Vāmana s *riti* was evidently independent of *rasa* Viśvanātha practically followed Ānanda vardhana while Rajaśekhara and Bhoja patronised the earlier view of Vāmana[4] Kuntaka, the well known propounder of the *vakrokti* theory made an original contribution to the *riti* school He gave importance to the poet's *svabhava* (personal disposition) and described and classified it on the basis thereof[5]

NUMBER AND NOMENCLATURE OF DIFFERENT *MĀRGAS*

As we have noticed above Bana refers to four literary manners prevalent in his time Daṇḍin recognises only two dictions which he names Vaidarbha and Gauḍa, though he remarks that the literary path of words is manifold and their

---

1 Cp *mārga* in KA I 9 40 67 75 101 II 3 etc *vartman* in KA I 42 92 ASK p 2 *paddhati* in KA I 50 76
2 Cp I 2 7-8 विशिष्टा पदरचना रीति । विशेषो गुणात्मा ।
3 Cp DhA III 5-6 & *vrtti* (pp 336 ff)
4 Cp SD IX 1 KMīm. III (pp 22-5)
5 VJ I 24 ff also cp De SPSA pp 31-2 intro to VJ pp xxxiii ff

sub divisions as established by individual poets are incalculable [1] It may be casually noted here that Bhāmaha does not admit the distinction even between the two *mārgas* of Dandin But since his attitude in this respect was indifferent, we should not attach much importance to his view Vamana, whom we have noticed above as the real propounder of the *riti* theory adds Pāñcālī to the two *mārgas* perhaps drawing either directly upon Bharata or on some current literary tradition Difference of opinion on the number of the *mārgas* continued even after Vāmana to which a detailed reference would be made later

The basis of the nomenclature of literary *mārgas* was apparently the locality which was considered to be patronising it and Vāmana clearly states in this regard that the *rītis* have been named after the localities on the basis of the characteristics noticed in the works of the poets of those regions No doubt every locality develops certain peculiar characteristics with regard to dress and social usages and to some extent in respect of poetic diction also It should not imply however as Vāmana himself clarifies, that the literary dictions are inseparable concomitants of the regions [3] In fact, as he further indicates the literary manners already existed in their original and un conscious form, and their nomenclature on the basis of different regions developed later In other words, the form of the literary manners on the basis of their constituent *gunas* was established first and their naming on the basis of the peculiarities generally noticed in the poets of the particular land came into being later [4] Subsequently, when these peculiarities crossed their regional limits, the *ritis* became generic names of particular

---

1 Cp KA I 9 40 101

2 Cp BKAI I 31-2

3 Cp I 2 9-10 and *vrtti*

4 Cp De SPSP p 64 HSP II p 91 and fn Acc to Ratna (on KA I 40) the *mārgas* like languages are intimately related to particular regions though they may be observed in other regions also as for instance sandal originally belonging to the Malaya mt is not ced elsewhere too As sandal is called *Malayaja* even if it is born else where so the *margas* are named after particular regions even if they are noticed elsewhere

dictions The regional nomenclature of the literary dictions remained for long a matter of controversy with the result that either the regional names were totally dropped or were redundantly retained with no relation whatsoever with the regions after which they were named

ORDER OF DEVELOPMENT OF DIFFERENT *MĀRGAS*

We cannot be certain with regard to the order of development of the different *mārgas* According to Jacobi[1] the *rīti* of the Gaudas preceded the Vaidarbha diction which came into being in about the third century A D as a reaction to the older and more ornate Gauḍī S K De, on the other hand thinks that Vaidarbhi was established earlier as the proper representation of the simpler and less ornate diction of the earlier *kāvya* literature, whereas Gauḍi followed it, along with the establishment of the more polished diction of the decadent poetry It is more reasonable, however, to suggest that the various dictions with their peculiar characteristics existed side by side, and only a few of them bearing clearer distinction, were named defined and discussed, as is clearly hinted by Daṇḍin[3]

THE *MĀRGA* DOCTRINE OF DAṆḌIN

Daṇḍin occupies a prominent place in the development of the *mārga* theory He was perhaps the first to give it a definite basis though he did not of course, establish the diction as the essence or soul of poetry as Vamana after him did There is no doubt however that the diction enjoys in his system, a prominent position in poetry His definition of *kavya* or rather its body (*śarira*)[4] as a sequence of words distinguished by the agreeable sense inspired him to think on the question of appropriate expression of the appropriate sense In other words it drew his attention to the appropriate combination of word and sense which has been technically termed *mārga* or *rīti*

1 Cp *Māhārāṣṭrī* p xvi
2 Cp HSP II p 91 fn
3 KA I 40 see below also
4 KA I 10 शरीर तावदिष्टार्थव्यवच्छिन्ना पदावली ।

His conception of *alamkāra* which he defines as the characteristics that lend beauty (*sobhā*) to poetry comprehends in its scope the decorative means as well as modes of arrangement of word and sense and as such, signifies the external effect brought about by an appropriate adjustment of word and sense which avoids the poetic defects and adopts primarily the literary excellences and secondarily the poetic figures This appropriate adjustment of word and sense appears to have been Daṇḍin's conception of *mārga*, though he has not formally defined it in his *Kāvyādarśa* The conception accords fully well with the subsequent exposition of it in Vamana and others who followed him

Here a few words may be said with regard to the relation between the old conception of *mārga* or *rīti* and the modern idea of style According to S K De, 'the term *rīti* is hardly equivalent to the English word 'style, by which it is often rendered but in which there is always a distinct subjective valuation Although *artha* (i e sense or idea) is admitted as an element by Sanskrit writers, the *rīti* consists essentially of the objective beauty of representation (of the intended idea) arising from a proper unification of certain clearly defined excellences or from an adjustment of sound and sense It is no doubt, recognised that appropriate ideas should find appropriate expression, or in other words the outward expression should be suitable to the inward sense But at the same time the *rīti* is not, like the style the expression of poetic individuality as it is generally understood by Western criticism, but it is merely the outward presentation of its beauty called forth by a harmonious combination of more or less fixed literary 'excellences' Of course the excellences are supposed to be discernible in the sense or import, as in the verbal arrangement, but this subjective content is not equivalent to the indefinable element of individuality which constitutes the charm of a good style '[1] On the other hand, V Raghavan tries to connect the two concepts by showing the subjective aspect of *rīti* on one hand and the objective side of style on the other with citations from Demetrius

1 HSP, II p 92 cp also SPSA pp 4–5, 30

and Aristotle[1] As a matter of fact, the objective aspect of the two concepts is more or less identical Although in the beginning Sanskrit theorists generally dealt with its objective side only there is no doubt that in the developed conception of *riti* the personal element is not altogether wanting[2] Daṇḍin in fact refers to personal element in diction when he remarks that dictions are infinite and their differences are subtle and adds that it is as difficult to define these differences as to describe the difference between various kinds of sweetness, of sugarcane milk and treacle etc[3] Kuntaka emphasises this subjective element by saying that diction is characterised not only by the way the web of words are woven, but also by a distinctive attitude in using poetic figures and delineating emotions[4] It must be admitted however, that the personal factor or subjectivity does not enjoy in Indian *riti* the prominence which it does in the western *style* It is therefore, the degree of the element of subjectivity in which the old *riti* and the modern style differ[5]

In order to understand fully the conception of *mārga* in Daṇḍin, the following points may be noted here

1 The path of speech is multifold since every poet possesses a distinct way of expressing a thing (I 40) It is difficult to draw a clear line of distinction between the various paths or dictions which differ from poet to poet, the mutual difference among them being too subtle to be defined (I 101-2)

2 The two *margas viz*, the Vaidarbha and the Gauḍa are however clearly distinguishable the points of difference in them being easily discernible (I 40) The two dictions rather possess divergent characteristics Daṇḍin most probably knew the western and northern dictions also which have been referred to by Bana He appears to have discarded them owing to the minor difference they had in his opinion from the southern (Vaidarbha) and the eastern (Gauḍa) paths Thus he accepted

---

1 Cp SCAS pp 140-72
2 Cp *ib I* pp 163-72
3 KA I 40 101-2
4 VJ I 24 ff
5 Cp also Nagendra BKB II pp 53-5 For *style* in Sanskrit Poetics also cp Krishna Chaitanya SP pp 105-11

only two extreme types and left out the intermediary forms

3 The *mārgas* possess certain characteristics which are of two kinds, namely, the general and the particular ones The general characteristics are the attributes which may be observed in all types of dictions (*mārgas*), or in other words, in a poetic composition in general The particular characteristics are the elements or, more precisely the excellences which constitute a specific *marga* and differentiate it from the other The ten excellences referred to by Daṇḍin are the elements which characterise the *marga* named Vaidarbha by him, while the *viparyaya* thereof is generally noticed in the other *mārga*, termed Gauḍa (I 41-2)

4 The enumeration, as also the elaboration, to some extent of these constituent elements or excellences was taken by Daṇḍin from the tradition coming down from Bharata But while Bharata treats them independently of the poetic diction and regards them as general excellences to be observed in a poetic composition, Dandin relates them perhaps for the first time, to the poetic diction In other words Dandin converts Bharata's excellences of a poetic composition in general into particular characteristics of the Vaidarbha diction It implies that the Vaidarbha *mārga* possessed of all the ten excellences as it is forms, in his opinion, a good poetic composition (*satkāvya*) If accepted to be an elliptical designation, the Vaidarbha *marga* stands for a standard good diction [1] In Bhāmaha, we do not notice the peculiar relation of excellences with dictions He treats only three excellences, and describes the Vaidarbha diction as possessed of certain qualities like *anati pusṭarthatva* (absence of excess of ideal maturity) *anativakrokti* (absence of excess of *vakrokti*), *prasāda* (perspicuity), *ārjava* (plainness) *komalatva* (softness) and *srutipesalatva* (pleasantness to the ear) and refers to the Gauḍa as characterised by *atya lamkara* (overornamentation) *grāmyatva* (vulgarity), *arthahinatva* (redundance) *anyāyyatva* (impropriety) and *akulatva* (perplexity) [2]

1 Cp Lahiri CRG pp 58 ff also cp S P Bhattacharya *Gauḍī Rīti in Theory and Practice* in IHQ (1927) p 379

2 BKAI I 34-35 also cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 131 8

But Bhāmaha s treatment of *gunas* is so brief and rather vague that no conclusion can be drawn from it as to whether or not he admitted their relationship with the *margas* The relation ship inaugurally proposed by Dandin was retained by Vāmana and some of the later theorists

5 The dictum that the *viparyaya* (transposition) of these *gunas* exists generally in the Gauda *mārga* implies that while some of the *gunas* characterise the two *margas* in their identical form, others do so in their changed position The excellences which characterise both the *margas* in their identical position are *mādhurya arthavyakti udaratva, ojas* and *samādhi* Whereas in Vaidarbha diction the possession of the ten *gunas* is essential in the other *marga*, the aforesaid five excellences and the changed form of the remaining five are observed casually (*prāyo dṛśyate*) [1]

6 The word *viparyaya* of Daṇḍin may be taken to denote twofold meaning viz, contrariety (*vaiparitya*) as Tarunavācaspati takes it or the transformed position (*anyathatva*) which need not be opposite, as the *Hṛdayamgamā* does The first meaning is objected to by some on the plea that since the ten *gunas* are expressive of aesthetic charm their opposites must essentially refer to grotesqueness and hence be defects and this being the case the Gauḍa diction may not come within the purview of *kāvya* But the instances of the diction cited by Daṇḍin are indeed, specimens of good poetry Answering the above objection Nagendra remarks that in Daṇḍin s opinion the *viparyayas* of the *gunas* do not constitute defects the *viparyayas* like *vyutpannata* (derivative sense) and *dipti* (glaringness) are cer tainly not *doṣas* Any form of verbal arrangement (*padaracana*), whether compounded or otherwise or compressed or expanded does not by itself elevate or diminish the charm of a *kavya* it may become an excellence or a fault according to the subject

1 Cp KA I 42 by connecting the word *prāyah* with *viparyaya* the phrase has been taken to mean that some of the *gunas* are common to both the *margas* (cp Taruṇa) In fact the commonness of some of them is clear from the specific statement of the author himself to that effect (cp I 75 76 80 100) In fact *prāyah* which is an adverb should be construed with the verb *dṛśyate* and not with the noun *viparyaya*

matter and idea Thus the *gunaviparyayas* or the opposites of the excellences are not at all synonymous with *dosas*, though they may not imply embellishment in the same degree as the excellences like *śleṣa* etc do In the *viparyayas* illustrated by Dandin the sense of contrariety appears as a rule, though in some examples it exists only partially as in *vyutpanna*, and in others it is complete as, for instance, in *śaithilya*[1] As a matter of fact, the interpretation *anyathātva* (changed form) of the *Hṛdayamgamā*[2] conveys this very sense The idea of contrariety, either partial or complete, comes within the precincts of the *anyathatva* As remarked above, the conception of *anyathatva* or *vaiparitya* of the *gunas* has been visualised by Dandin within the scope of the *kāvya* Hence the opposites of *prasada, kanti* and *sukumaratā* have not been spoken of as *klista* (obscurity), *asvābhavikatva* (unnaturalness) and *srutikatu* (acoustic unpleasantness) respectively, for in that case, the opposites would have gone out of the sphere of *kavya* and entered the arena of defects On the contrary, the elements of derivative sense, exaggeration and glaringness (*vyutpanna, atyukti* and *dipti*) have been recognised respectively as the opposites of these excellences and they do come within the fold of poetry[3]

7 Although Danḍin considers the Gauḍa *marga* to be a diction of second degree, he accords it due recognition as a literary path His predilection for the Vaidarbha diction is more than evident He regards this *mārga* as a standard diction which favours the classical and the refined manner of expression The *mārga*, according to him, insists on tenderness, compactness and force, in the arrangement of words and on evenness of diction, and with regard to sense it demands limpidity and explicitness as also sublimity and spontaneity of emotions and ornateness in expression, and, above all, emphasises sweetness both of word and sense The Gauḍa *mārga*, on the other hand prefers fervidity and harshness and alliteration and allows therefore laxity and unevenness of diction to creep in With regard

1 Cp Nagendra HKAS intro pp 35 36

2 Cp KA, Rangacharya ed p 29

3 Cp Nagendra HKAS intro pp 36 7 also Lahiri CRG pp 58 ff

to the sense, though it insists on explicitness, it would permit obscurity for verbal brilliance, and delights in bombast and elaboration and in hyperbolic expression It is noteworthy that Bāna also mentions the trait of verbosity (*akṣaraḍambara*) with reference to the Gauḍa *mārga* On the other hand, Vaidarbha or the southern diction has been traditionally regarded as an abode of grace and beauty While describing the *pravṛttis*, Bharata refers to the southern *pravṛtti* as being possessed of the clever, sweet and charming gesticulated acting (*kaiśikīprāya* and *caturamadhuralalitangabhinayā*) Bana mentions poetic fancy (*utprekṣā*) as a dominating characteristic of the southern diction Probably this statement of his represents his personal, and not traditional, observation It cannot be held therefore, that Bana's conception of the southern diction had changed in Daṇḍin s time and that the Vaidarbha had developed a graceful style,[1] because the two writers were not separated from each other by a period of more than half a century Otherwise too, the poetic fancy must have occupied an important place in the graceful style

FOLLOWERS OF DANḌIN

Among the followers of Daṇḍin Vamana enjoys the most prominent place in the history of the development of *rīti* theory He establishes the *rīti* or diction as the soul of poetry and in a way, gives the doctrine a definite form [2] He introduces a third *rīti* as intermediary between the two *margas* of Daṇḍin and names it Pañcalī perhaps on the suggestion of the Pañcālī *pravṛtti* of Bharata He describes the Gauḍiya as consisting of *ojas* and *kanti* the Pāñcalī as possessing *mādhurya* and *saukumarya* and the Vaidarbhī as endowed with all the excellences He accords, on the line of Daṇḍin the most prominent place to the Vaidarbhī *rīti* on account of its being characterised by all the *gunas* and above all, being devoid of defects [3] Rudraṭa

1 Cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 131 8

2. KASV I 2 6 रीतिरात्मा काव्यस्य, cp for detail Nagendra HKAS intro pp 30 57

3. Cp I 2 11

soon after him adds a fourth *rīti*, Lātīyā and determines the compounds (*samasas*) as the basis of their division Thus according to him, absence of compounds forms a characteristic of Vaidarbhi *riti*, employment of short compounds that of Pañcāli and the use of compounds of moderate length that of the Lātiyā diction while Gauḍiyā was characterised by the employment of long compounds [1] He also relates the *ritis* to the sentiments perhaps on the inspiration of similar assignment of Bharata's dramatic manners (*vṛttis*) to different *rasas* [2] The sentiments of love pathos, fear and wonder were associated with Vaidarbhī and Pāñcāli *ritis*, while the other two *rītis* were connected with the sentiment of fury [3] Rudrata discards the geographical association of *ritis*, though he does not abandon the regional nomenclature In the later period, Śingabhūpala and Rājaśekhara recognised only three *ritis* of Vamana The former, however, dropped the geographical names and adopted the terms *komalā* (soft), *kaṭhinā* (harsh) and *misrā* (mixed) *vṛttis* for Vaidarbhī, Gauḍi and Pāñcāli *rītis* respectively Rājasekhara puts forth application of derivative meaning (*yogavṛtti*) as the distinguishing feature of different *ritis* [4] Bhoja, adding Āvantikā and Māgadhi to the list of Rudrata, makes the number six [5] His classification and description of the *ritis* is mechanical and arbitrary Kuntaka substantially follows Vamana, though he gives up local names with the specific remark that the *ritis* can not be equated with social usages of particular lands [6] He bases the diction (*marga*) on the natural disposition of poet (*kavi svabhāva*) and classifies it accordingly into *sukumāra* (delicate), *vicitra* (ornate) and *madhyama* (middle) ones [7] On the other

---

1 Cp RKAl II 4 ff XV 20 Agni P (340 1-4) follows him also cp DhA III 5
2 BNS XX 1 ff see above also
3 Cp RKAl XV 20
4 Cp KMIm III (pp 22 5)
5 Cp ŚPr X, Josyer ed II p 373 for his concept of *riti* cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 189 94
6 Cp VJ I 24 *vṛtti*
7 VJ I 24-58 (with *vṛtti*) for detail also cp S K De VJ intro pp xxxiii ff

hand, the *rasa dhvani* theorists generally accept in substance the three *rītis* of Vāmana in the form of three *vṛttis*, namely, *upanāgarikā* (refined), *paruṣā* (harsh) and *komala* (soft) comparable respectively to the Vaidarbhī, Gauḍī and Pāñcālī dictions[1] *Vṛtti* and *rīti* have been differentiated by Udbhaṭa, Rudraṭa and Abhinavagupta Viśvanātha gives an indirect hint to the effect that the arrangement of syllables in other words, the *vṛtti* constitutes only a part of *rīti*[3] In fact, *vṛtti* or *varṇagumpha* is an external element or aspect of *rīti*, the other aspect being *padasaṃghaṭanā* the arrangement of words Mammaṭa regards the two as almost identical[4] Later, Jagannātha fully identifies the two[5]

The theorists of the post *dhvani* period regard *rīti* as an external element in accordance with their new conception that distinguished the body from the soul which position in poetry they accorded to the suggestion of *rasa* According to this doctrine the *rīti* assists the realisation of sentiment just as the structure of body assists the soul[6]

---

1 Cp DhA III 47 f KPr IX k 80 f Nagendra BKB pp 88 91
2 DhAL I I *vṛtti* (pp 19 22)
3 SD IX 2 also cp Nagendra intro to HKAS pp 53-4
4 Cp KPr IX k 80-1 and *vṛtti*
5 Cp RG p 73
6 Cp SD IX 1 पदसंघटना रीतिरङ्गसंस्थाविशेषवत् । उपकर्त्री रसादीनाम् ॥

CHAPTER IV

THE TEN *GUNAS* OF DANDIN

ORIGIN AND CONCEPTION OF *GUNAS*

The number and the names of the *gunas* of Bharata as also the substance of some of them were adopted in tradition by his followers There is no doubt that in Bharata we have, for the first time a definite statement, if not the exposition, of the *guna* doctrine though his conception of individual *gunas* was either totally dropped or only partially retained by later theorists As S K De remarks in this connection, the disagreement between the different writers with regard to the definition of individual *gunas* is a common experience in the history of Sanskrit Poetics [1] It is not surprising therefore, that there is a wide gulf between Bharata and later theorists with regard to the conception of certain *gunas*

Bharata describes the *gunas* as negative forms of the defects,[2] and thus regards them in spirit as negative elements His treatment of them, however, does not indicate or support the negative aspect of all his *gunas* The excellences such as *mādhurya* and *audārya*, for instance, as defined by himself, are not really negations of any particular defects Nor can they be held to be the opposites of the ten defects discussed by him Jacobi s explanation appears to be correct that Bharata s view is in keeping with the commonsense view of the matter that it is easier to seize upon a defect instinctively [3] Although Bharata does not define the term *guna* it is evident that, according to him, *gunas* are the elements which make the oral acting in a drama and the language and diction in poetry impressive and forceful

---

1 Cp HSP II p 16

2 Cp BNS XVII 95

3 Cp *Sb der preuss Akad* xxiv (1922) p 223 (quoted by De HSP II p 12)

After Bharata Daṇḍin makes an elaborate exposition of the *guna* doctrine though he gives them a subordinate place in his *mārga* scheme for, according to him, *gunas* form the constituent elements of the *margas* Daṇḍin is the first known theorist who related the *gunas* to the dictions, for we know for certain that Bharata before him was unaware of this peculiar relationship Like Bharata, he also does not define the *gunas* as such, though his definition of the *alamkāras* may be stated to cover the *gunas* also which he regards as the special *alamkaras* that characterise the various *margas* According to this scheme, the *gunas* are the characteristic attributes which beautify a *kavya* in general and form the constituent elements of the literary dictions in particular

The *gunas* have not been made subordinate to *rasa* by Daṇḍin as they have been done by some later theorists but in his scheme they rather form independent parts of a *kavya* In other words they render direct assistance to a *kāvya*, without in any way, being subservient to the *rasa* Daṇḍin as we have seen describes *kavya* as a series of words expressive of charming sense the charm of the series of words in consequence forms the charm of the *kavya* and in this way the elements which lend essential grace to a poem are directly related to the series of words characterised by charming sense that is they refer to the word as well as the sense conveyed thereby

Vamana for the first time supplies *guna* with a definition He presents Daṇḍin s definition of *alamkara* as that of his *guna* Daṇḍin s conception of *alamkara* is, as we have seen vast enough to cover the sphere of the excellences (*gunas*) But since Vamana makes a clear cut distinction between the two, he slightly alters his predecessor s conception of *alamkāra* Thus according to him *gunas* are the elements which impart essential beauty to a poem, while *alamkaras* are the attributes which add to the charm[1] In another form the *gunas* constitute the permanent and indispensable characteristics of a *kavya*[2] where

1 Cp KASV III 1 1-2 काव्यशोभाया कर्तारो धर्मा गुणा । तदतिशय हेतवस्त्वलङ्काराः ।

2. Cp III 1 3 also cp SKA I 59 ŚPr IX (Josyer ed p 340) KPr VIII k 66 7 *vrtti*

as *alaṁkāras* the transitory elements which may be dispensed with Vāmana like Daṇḍin, relates the *guṇas* directly to the word and sense,[1] without subordinating them to *rasa* Instead he subordinates *rasa* itself to *guṇa* by defining the excellence *kānti* as predominance of *rasa*[2] Like Daṇḍin again he establishes their relationship with poetic dictions, though while Daṇḍin regards the ten *guṇas* as the life breath of the Vaidarbha *mārga*, Vāmana considers them to be constituent elements of the *rīti* in general[3] Significantly enough Vāmana regards the *guṇas* as positive elements and the defects as their negations[4] One novel feature which he introduces in his treatment of the *guṇas* lies in enhancing their scope and practically increasing thereby their number to twenty He divides each of the ten *guṇas* into those relating to the word and the sense[5] In order to accommodate this change he has to alter some of the earlier definitions and introduce some new points, which, many of them, must be admitted as being farfetched and in this task he cannot be held to have succeeded for one can clearly see that his *guṇas* have stood afar from the concepts that their names imply S K De rightly observes about his treatment of the *guṇas*

The somewhat pedantic classification of *guṇas* into external and internal verbal and ideal is in itself open to objections and has been controverted by later writers (e g Mammata VIII Hemacandra, pp 195-200, Jagannātha p 62 f) The distinctions are sometimes unconvincing they are made for the sake of symmetry of having two sets each of ten excellences[6] We must admit, however the fact that 'Bharata's scheme of the *guṇas* as a whole is developed to its farthest possibilities by Vāmana[7]

---

1 Cp III 1 1 *vṛtti* acc. to the comm though *guṇas* are strictly speaking concerned directly with *rīti* they are spoken of as elements of word and sense as a popular use of the term. Also cp Pratap p 337 which quotes the view of Udbhaṭa and others that the *guṇas* are related to *rīti* whereas the poetic figures refer to word and sense

2 III 2 14 दीप्तरसत्वं कान्तिः ।

3 KASV I 2 7-8 cp KA I 42

4 Cp II 1 1-3

5 III 1 4 to III 2 14

6 HSP II, pp 95-6

7 *Ibid*, p 98

The *dhvani* theorists and almost all the writers who followed them generally considered the *gunas* as before to be the beautifying elements of poetry, though they subordinated them to the predominant principle of *rasa*[1] According to these theorists *gunas* in contrast with the *alamkaras* form the characteristics of *rasa* the soul of poetry, and not of word and sense, the mere body thereof The doctrine however could not win universal acceptance, for we see that while Jagannātha specifically regards *gunas* as elements of word and sense Mammata and Visvanatha clearly establish the relation of their *gunas* with words Thus the *gunas*, though fundamentally the attributes of *rasa* are generally related to the word and sense which form the body of poetry[3]

NUMBER OF *GUNAS*

With regard to the number of *gunas* we meet with, from very early period two opposite tendencies Bharata and Dandin define and discuss ten *gunas* But after them, while on one hand Bhāmaha reduces their number to three on the other Vāmana virtually increases their number to twenty The tendency to increase the number is well exhibited in a writer like Bhoja who enumerates as many as seventy two *gunas* in three groups each formed of twenty four of them His first group belongs to the word and second to the sense, while *defects changing* into excellences in particular conditions constitute the third group called *vaiśesika* or specific *gunas*[4] The *Agni Purana* enumerates eighteen *gunas*, six each of word and sense and six referring to both of them[5] Kuntaka also gives the same number of *gunas*, but on an entirely different basis On the basis of the natural disposition of a poet (*kavisvabhāva*) he considers literary diction (*marga*) to be either delicate (*sukumāra*) or ornate (*vicitra*) or

1 Cp DhAL II 6 & *vrtti* (pp 216 ff) KPr VIII k 66 SD VIII 1
2 Cp RG pp 66 ff KPr VIII k 73 7 SD VIII 3-4 5 f 8
3 Cp KPr VIII k 71 SD VIII 8 cp Nagendra HKAS intro pp 61 63
4 Cp ŚPr IX (Josyer ed. II pp 341 ff)
5 Cp 346 5 25 The elaboration of various *gunas* however is most confusing

middle (*madhyama*), each having six characteristics technically called *gunas* [1] As a matter of fact, the drift towards increasing the number forms no originality or speciality Bhoja and the author of *Agni Purāna* have, in fact made a mess of the subject while Vāmana, too, cannot be credited with success in this respect [2]

The *dhvani* theorists as also the later rhetoricians in general recognise only the three *gunas*, *mādhurya ojas* and *prasāda*, while they some of them accommodate other excellences either as part of the said three *gunas* or as negative forms of certain defects or even as poetic figures Mammata, it may be noted includes Vāmana's verbal *gunas*, *slesa*, *samādhi*, *udāratā* and *prasāda* in his *ojas* verbal *mādhurya* in his *mādhurya* verbal *arthavyakti* in his *prasāda*, ideal *arthavyakti* and ideal *kānti* in his *svabhāvokti* figure while he takes the verbal *gunas saukumārya* and *kānti* as negations of the defects *kastatva* and *grāmyatva*, the ideal *gunas*, *ojas*, *prasāda*, *mādhurya saukumārya* and *udāratā* as negative forms of the defects *apustārtha adhika padatva*, *anavikrtatva amangalarūpa aslilatva* and *grāmyatva* respectively as also the ideal *samatā* as the absence of the fault *vaisamya* Again it is interesting to note that he regards the verbal *samatā* as a defect rather than an excellence, while he rejects outright the ideal *gunas*, *ojas slesa* and *samādhi* Thus he refutes almost all the older *gunas* along with their conceptions (as obtaining particularly in Vamana), and sets out the three *gunas ojas prasāda* and *mādhurya* with new meanings [3] Hemacandra Visvanātha and others follow him [4] These theorists explain *gunas* as the characteristics of *rasa*, indicative of different states of mind On the basis of three attitudes of the mind namely, fluidity (*druti*), glaringness (*dīpti*) and expansion (*vyāpti*) in the process of the realisation of *rasa* the *gunas mādhurya ojas* and *prasāda* are formed in their respective order [5] Since

1 VJ I 30 ff cp De intro to VJ pp xxxv–xxxvi HSP II pp 190-1

2 Cp De HSP II pp 95-6 also Nagendra BKB p 67

3 Cp KPr VIII k 68 72

4 For a detailed history of *gunas* see V Raghavan ŚPr pp 249 351 also cp Nagendra intro to HKAS pp 58 80

5 Cp KPr VIII k 68 71 SD VIII 2 8 also cp DhA and Loc II 8 10

the *gunas* are, as we have seen above, generally regarded as the attributes of word and sense they are also treated on the basis of the peculiar arrangement of syllables as also that of words [1]

THE *GUNAS* OF DANḌIN IN RELATION TO VAIDARBHA DICTION

As noticed above, Dandin considers the *gunas* to be the basic elements of poetic diction Vamana also patronises the same view when he defines *riti* as the peculiar arrangement of words (विशिष्टा पदरचना), the peculiarity being brought about by the poetic excellences (विशेषो गुणात्मा) He has, however, expanded the scope of the *riti* by dividing the *gunas*, the characteristic elements, into two groups, one referring to word and the other to sense In his *riti guna* scheme he accepts, in spirit the senti ments poetic figures, the expressive powers of words and the negation of defects besides the usual *gunas*, as the chief elements of *riti* The peculiar arrangement or knitting of words, with its footing on the *gunas* forms in his view the external aspect of the *rīti*, the internal elements being the *rasa*, ideal figures and absence of defects Evidently his viewpoint is an improvement on that of Dandin whose conception of *mārga guna* is not so comprehensive though it must be admitted that he implicitly accepts the poetic figures, the expressive powers of words and the negation of defects as constituent elements of diction After Dandin and Vamana a few more attributes like *yogavṛtti* (application of derivative meaning) *upacara* (application of figurative meaning) and softness were introduced by later theo rists as the principal elements of diction [2]

First of all we propose to discuss the *gunas* of Danḍin in their origin and gradual development in later times with a reference to their relation with the Vaidarbha *marga* which is described as possessed of all the ten excellences [3]

1 *Śleṣa* (compactness) or the quality of being well knit is the *saithilyarahitva* (absence of laxity) generating from the

---

cp Nagendra BKB pp 69 70 intro to HKAS pp 63 ?

1 Cp I Pr VIII k 73 ff

2 Cp KMim III pp 22 5 Nagendra HKAS intro pp 47 9

3 Cp KA I 40 also cp Vāmana KASV I 2 11

abundant use of *alpaprana* (unaspirated) letters[1] (short vowels, the first third and fifth letters of the five classes of consonants, and the semi vowels) and from the employment of aspirate letters in a smaller quantity, e g मालतीदाम लङ्घित भ्रमरै (I 54) where all letters excepting *gh* and *bh* are unaspirated ones

According to Bharata, *slesa* consists in (a) subtlety, clear in appearance, but in fact difficult to observe and (b) coalescence of words connected with one another through the aggregate meaning desired by the poet[3] Vāmana s *slesa*, as a verbal *guna*, is the coalescence of words resulting in smoothness while as an ideal *guna* it is the commingling of many ideas[4] Evidently, Dandin s *guna* resembles the second (b) part of Bharata s definition, while it is close to the verbal *guna* of Vamana who has obviously drawn upon Dandin

2 *Prasada* or lucidity is the use of words easy of comprehension and free of affectation, e g इन्दोरिन्दीवरद्युति, लक्ष्म लक्ष्मीं तनोति (the blue lotus like spot of the moon adds to its charm') (I 45)

In Bharata it is the clearness where sense transpires from the words employed, through the relation of the easily under stood word and sense[5] According to S K De Bharata here implies some kind of hint (*anukta artha*), transparent from the words used, and this corresponds partly to the metaphorical way of expression or Dandin s *guna samadhi* or to the *laksanā* of later theorists[6] But in fact the word *anukta* (in Bharata s

---

1 By letters Dandin means here only the consonants because vowels (long ones) even if they are *mahapranas* are soft and hence result in loose ness

2 This is what the phrase अल्पप्राणाक्षरोत्तरम् (KA I 43) exactly implies cp Kramadisvara cited in Jivananda s comm Dandin sees non resi dence of laxity in the co-existence of both kinds of letters though of course with a difference in their relative quantity in the aforesaid way If only the unaspirated letters appear there will occur the fault of looseness see below the fact has been hinted at by Dandin himself cp I 69

3 Cp BNS XVII 97 8

4 Cp III 1 10 2 4

5 Cp XVII 99

6 HSP II pp 12 3 fn 97

definition of the *guna*) which De takes to mean *unexpressed* should be taken in the sense of *avyakhyāta* 'which needs no explanation, as is suggested by the subsequent phrase सुख शब्दार्थसंबोधात In this case there is nothing suggestive of *lakṣaṇā* or *samādhi* here Bhāmaha describes *prasāda* as comprehension of the sense even by the womenfolk and children [1] Vāmana s *prasada* as a verbal excellence is the laxity of structure and as an ideal *guna* it is clearness of meaning brought about by the avoidance of superfluity It is evident that Dandin's *guna* bears a close resemblance to its conception in Bharata as also in his successors like Bhāmaha and Vamana The later theorists define it as that which causes the sense to pervade the mind instantaneously and spread like fire in dry fuel [3] The verbal *guna* of Vāmana, however deviates from the usual track it is obviously the opposite of Dandin s *śleṣa* Its admissibility as a *guna* depends on its communion with *ojas* which he himself describes as the compactness of structure [4]

3 *Samatā* is evenness in the grouping of word sounds which are of three kinds (i) soft, (ii) harsh and (iii) middling arising respectively from the use of soft harsh and mixed letters [5] e g (i) कोकिलालापवाचालो माम एति मलयानिल (ii) उच्छलच्छीकराच्छाच्छनिर्झराम्भ कणोक्षित (iii) चन्दनप्रणयोद्गन्धिर्मन्दो मलयमारुत (I 47-9)

In Bharata according to one recension, it is the evenness which is easy to understand and in which there is no redundance of expression nor excess of short compounds (*curnapadas*) and according to the other and better reading it is the balanced co

1 BKAl II 3
2 Cp III 1 6 2 3
3 Cp DhA and Loc II 10 KPr VIII k 70-1 76 SD VIII 7
4 Cp III 1 6-9 see below also
5 Hrd (on KA I 47) is not right in suggesting that the soft and harsh *bandhas* are accepted by the Gauḍas and only the mixed one by the Vaidarbhas for its being not uneven (cp Rangacarya s ed p 31) Ratna rightly refutes the view in detail and maintains that all the three *bandhas* are accepted in the Vaidarbha diction He cites Ragh (IV 64) a southern styled *kāvya* to show that they have been employed in the Vaidarbha *mārga*

existence of poetic figures and excellences [1] Vamana describes its verbal aspect as homogeneity of manner (*mārga*) and its ideal form as non relinquishment of proper sequence of ideas [2] Abhinavagupta compares Bharata's *guna* to Vāmana s verbal excellence which is on its part, closely comparable to Dandin s conception

4 *Madhurya* or sweetness is the elegance consisting of (i) alliteration technically called *srutyanuprasa* which is the grouping of similar sounds belonging to the same place of articulation and (ii) absence of vulgarity (I 51-68) The verbal and ideal forms of sweetness have been called *vag rasa* and *vastu rasa*[3] respectively The examples of the two forms are (i) alliteration एष राजा यदा लक्ष्मीं प्राप्तवान् ब्राह्मणप्रिय । तदा प्रभृति धर्मस्य लोकेऽस्मि नुत्सवोऽभवत (I 53), (ii) absence of vulgarity काम कन्दर्पचाण्डालो मयि वामाक्षि निर्दय । त्वयि निर्मत्सरो दिष्ट्या (I 64)

In Bharata, it is sweetness where a sentence heard or repeated many times does not bore or disgust [4] According to Bhāmaha the *madhurya* of *kavya* consists in (i) its being pleasing to the ear and in (ii) the use of a smaller number of compounds, while Vamana calls it as a verbal *guna* the distinctness of words due to absence of long compounds and, as an ideal *guna*, the strikingness of utterance (*uktivaicitrya*) [5]

Bharata s *guna* is a general excellence, the first element of the *guna* in Dandin and Bhāmaha bears close resemblance there to Dandin s ideal sweetness or *vasturasa* has been taken by Vamana in his conception of ideal aspect of *udaratā* while the second characteristic in Bhāmaha s conception has been adopted

---

1 Cp (a) GOS ed XVI 100 (b) ChSS ed. XVII 100

2 Cp III 1 11 2 5

3 KA I 51 As De (*Sir Ashutosh Mookerjee Silver Jubilee Vol [Orientalia* vol III] pp 212 ff) points out the term *rasa* here bears distinct sense *which is different from that given to it by the rasa* school or even by Daṇḍin at another occasion (KA II 292) cp also Lahiri CRG pp 67 8 It may be noted here that Ratna explains *rasāvaha* (KA I 52) as रसम भावहति श्रुतिसुभगताम आतनोतीति । Bhoja however probably due to misunderstanding cites Daṇḍin s I 63 (*kanye* etc) in the context of *rasa* exposition

4 BNS XVII 102

5 Cp (a) BKAI II 1 (b) KASV III 1 20 2 10

by him in his *mādhurya* as a verbal excellence Vāmana's ideal *guṇa*, however, is his own creation [1] Bhoja follows Vamana's conception of verbal *madhurya* In *rasadhvani* theorists, it is the source of pleasure caused by fluidity of heart, arising from absence or rarity of compounds [3]

5 *Sukumarata* (softness) consists in the absence of harshness due to the use mostly of soft vocables [4] with the implied employment of harsh vocables also at places,[5] so that the diction may not become 'all soft' (*sarva komala*) which condition constitutes the defect of looseness of diction (*bandhaśaithilya*) [6] The example is मण्डलीकृत्य बर्हाणि कण्ठमधुरगीतिभि । कलापिन प्रनृत्यन्ति काले जीमूतमालिनि ॥ (I 77)

According to Bharata, it is smoothness where an agreeable sense is realised by means of agreeably employed words and well formed euphonic combinations [7] In Vamana, it is the absence of harshness as a verbal *guṇa* and freedom from disagreeable sense (*aparuṣya*) as an ideal excellence [8] Daṇḍin whom Vamana follows in his verbal excellence partially takes his conception from Bharata Vāmana's ideal aspect of the *guṇa* has been directly adopted from a part of Bharata's definition which we do not notice in Daṇḍin, though he has indirectly accepted the idea by admitting the existence of agreeable sense (*anurjita* or *sukumāra artha*) in his illustration [9]

---

1 Bhamaha and later rhetoricians would term the strikingness of utterance as *vakrokti* which they consider to be the fundamental principle underlying all figurative expression Daṇḍin's *vakrokti* (KA II 363) too has this very import cp below

2 SKA I 68 ŚPr IX (Josyer ed II p 341)

3 SD VIII 2 4 also cp KPr VIII k 68 74 DhA II 8

4 Cp Tarkavāgīsa (on KA I 69) who remarks that it consists in tenderness as a total effect arising from the commingling of soft and harsh letters Acc to him *alpaprāṇa* letters are not necessarily soft they may become harsh in their conjunction with particular letters It appears however from KA I 69 that the author considers them to be soft cp also Lahiri CRG p 72

5 Cp Ratna and Taruna on KA I 69

6 KA I 69

7 Cp BNS XVII 104

8 Cp III 1 21 2 11

9 KA I 71

Vāmana has interpreted Bharata's agreeable sense (*sukumāra artha*) as avoidance of inauspicious sense [1] It is on this ground that Mammaṭa and others do not regard it as a *guna*, but take it merely as the negation of the defect of inauspicious meaning [2] But this sense was meant neither by Bharata[3] nor by Daṇḍin

6 *Arthavyakti* (precision of expression) is the explicitness of sense, or absence of its *neyatā* (implicitness) if the ocean is to be described as red, the cause of its redness should also be stated, as in the example हरिणोद्धृता । भूः खुरक्षुण्णनागासृग्लोहिताद् उदधेः (Viṣṇu in his Boar incarnation lifted up the earth from the ocean which had got red *through the blood of the serpents crushed under his hooves*) If, however, the cause is left to be implied, it would suffer from the defect of inexplicitness (I 73-5)

In Bharata, according to one recension, it is explicitness which describes the nature of things as they appear in the world by means of well known predicates, and according to the other version, it is perspicuity of sense, comparable to his own as well as Daṇḍin's *prasāda* [4] Daṇḍin's *arthavyakti* is evidently different from Bharata's first quoted conception of it which bears resemblance to the former's *svabhāvokti* figure [5] Vāmana explains the verbal form of the *guna* as explicitness of words whereby the meaning is easily apprehended, while its ideal aspect has been described by him as explicitness of idea which makes the nature of things clear [6] Vāmana's verbal excellence takes

---

1 Cp Vāmana's *vṛtti* on III 2 11

2 KPr VIII k 72

3 De (HSP II p 14 fn), however seems to ascribe this sense to Bharata

4 Cp BNS (a) GOS ed XVI 103 (b) ChSS ed XVII 105 for the *guna prasāda* see above also cp KPr VIII k 72 f and SD VIII 11 2, which include it in *prasāda*

5 The fact is admitted by later writers also cp Mammaṭa (KPr VIII k 72 *vṛtti*) also cp SD VIII 15 Bhoja however, tries to differentiate between the two by saying that the figure describes the present form of a thing while the *guna* depicts the everlasting aspect thereof (cp SKA III 4 5 ŚPr X Joyer ed II p 391) and Agni P (344 3-4 the text however is not clear) divides *svabhāvokti* into two varieties present and everlasting

6 Cp III 1 23, 2 13

its inspiration from Bharata's conception (in ChSS recension), while his ideal *guna* resembles Bharata's first quoted view, and is very close to the conception of *svabhāvokti* in Dandin and later writers Dandin does not follow Bharata's conception of the *guna* which, however, is the source of Vamana's exposition of the excellence [1] Dandin gives it a new explanation perhaps in order to distinguish it from the *guna, prasada* in which the sense must not be unusual and words should be used in their generally understood sense *Arthavyakti*, on the other hand is avoidance of implicitness of sense or the connection of ideas apprehended from the words actually used [2] Dandin might have noticed the defect of one *guna* overlapping the other in Bharata, though he admits that both the *gunas* bring about easy comprehension (*pratītisubhagatva*) in poetry, and thus accepts their closeness to some extent [3] The basis of his new explanation is the explicitness of sense, or the absence of the defect of implicitness (*neyata*) of sense [4] He explains the excellence also as the law of the expressive power of words (*śabdanyāya*) [5] According to the *Hṛdayamgamā*, it is the condition where an ellipsis need not be supplied to make the sense clear and complete

7 *Udāratva* consists in (i) the elevation in the form of the expression of some high merit or virtue and (ii) the employment of excellent epithets (I 76, 79) The example of the depiction of great merit is as follows अर्थिनां कृपणा दृष्टिस्त्वन्मुखे पतिता सकृत् । तदवस्था पुनर्देव नान्यस्य मुखमीक्षते ॥ (I 70) (Once the sad eye of the supplicants has fallen on thy face O king, it taketh there its abode, and gazeth not at the face of any other) where high virtue of charity has been expressed As is evident from the

1 Hemacandra (KAn (KM ed) p 239) equates Bharata's *arthavyakti* with Vāmana's ideal *guna* of the same name cp De HSP II p 15 fn
2 Cp Lahiri CRG p 74 also J Nobel FIP p 111
3 Cp KA I 45 75
4 Bhāmaha probably derives inspiration from Dandin's exposition of the *guna* for his fault *neyārtha* (BKAl I 38) cp the term *śabdanyāya* which occurs both in KA I 75 and BKAl I 38
5 Cp KA I 75 Hṛd. explains it as a proper balance of word and sense cp SKA I 69 which adopts Daṇḍin's *arthavyakti* also cp I 12 34 130 ŚPr IX (Josyer ed. II p 341)

example the *guṇa* refers not to any elevated way of expression, but to excellent merit of the subject matter in hand The second form of the *guṇa* may be exemplified by expressions like *līlāmbuja* (sport lotus) *krīḍāsaras* (sport lake), *hemāngada* (gold bracelet) etc, which embody high wrought appellatives [1]

In Bharata, according to one recension, it is exaltedness where there are superhuman sentiments, varied feelings and erotic and marvellous moods, and according to another reading, it is the quality consisting in the particular meanings, in varied forms, conveyed beautifully [2] Vamana calls it, as a verbal *guṇa*, liveliness (*vikaṭatva*) in which the words appear as if they are dancing, while his ideal excellence is decency or absence of vulgarity [3] *Bharata's exaltedness is the outcome of the superhuman* and marvellous elements which may be traced partially in Vāmana's ideal aspect of the *guṇa*, *kānti*, containing as it does the idea of *rasa* or sentiment [4] Daṇḍin s elevation, however, is based on quite a different principle His second form appears to be the result of misinterpretation of Bharata's second reading [5] Vamana's ideal *guṇa*, *udaratva* is the same as Dandin's ideal *madhurya*, noted above Bhoja, perhaps misunderstanding Vāmana's verbal *guṇa*, describes *udaratā* as verbosity (*vikaṭākṣarabandhatva*),[6] and in order to accommodate Daṇḍin's second

1 Taruna (on KA I 79) interprets *ślāghya* as *vaiśiṣṭyapratītikṛt* i e, indicative of the particularity of an object, and this is apparently supported by Daṇḍin s examples But we need not take it in this restricted sense alone cp also Lahiri CRG p 76

2 Cp (a) GOS ed XVI 110 (b) ChSS ed XVII 106 (Hemacandra patronises this reading)

3 Cp III 1 22 2 12

4 Cp III 2 14 see below

5 Cp *viśeṣa* (in Bharata) > *viśeṣaṇa* (in Daṇḍin) Bāṇa (Hcar intro v 8 Kād intro v 9) probably refers to this *guṇa* of Bharata in his *nava artha* or *padārtha*

6 Cp KASV III 1 22 ŚPr IX (Josyer ed II p 342) *vikaṭākṣarabandha* also termed *akṣaraḍambara* has been mentioned as one of the characteristics of Gauḍa diction in Hcar (intro v 7-8) In SKA I 28 f & ŚPr IX p 338 (Josyer ed II) Bhoja gives *analaṃkāra* as the opposite of verbosity implying thereby that the latter is characterised by the existence of poetic figures

explanation of the *guna* introduces a new excellence named *udattatā*[1] *Agni Purāna* on the other hand, tries unsuccessfully to combine the misconceived idea of Vāmana s verbal *guna* and Dandin s second form of the excellence into one by describing it as elevation of words (*uttāna padatā*) composed of excellent attributes[2]

8 *Ojas* is the force effected by the presence or profusion of compounds (*samāsabhuyastva*)[3] which is regarded as the soul of prose[4] The *samāsahuyastva*, again should be unconfused (*anākula*)[5] and charming (*hṛdya*) Owing to the variance in quantity as well as in the length of compounds employed, the *ojas* registers numerous varieties, different forms occur according as the compounds employed are in abundance, in paucity or in moderate quantity, or as they are either lengthy or short in measure[6] Thus, *ojas* has six main varieties (i) abundance of

---

1 Cp ŚPr IX (Josyer ed II p 341) Perhaps it has been inspired by the figure of that name Daṇḍin s *udaratva* however must be distinguished from his own figure *udatta* (II 300) where greatness high merit or prosperity of a personage is depicted directly and in this light the *pratiyate* (is implied) in the definition of *udaratva* is significant though it need not mean any technical suggestiveness of the *dhvani* theorists cp Lahiri CRG p 75 fn It must however be admitted that the figure *udatta* and the excellence *udaratva* resemble closely

2 Cp Agni-P 346 9 in Daṇḍin and even in Vāmana the idea of *uttāna padatā* is absent it however corresponds to *akṣaraḍambara* of Bāṇa or *vikaṭakṣarabandhatva* of Bhoja

3 By *bhuyastva* the author probably means *presence* because in the next verse (I 81) he refers to the paucity of compounds as a variety of *ojas* We may however take it to mean *abundance* also But it can by no means indicate *lengthiness* (of compounds) for which he gives another word (*gurutva*) In fact lengthy compounds do not form a real *guna* and Vāmana (III 1 20) admits the presence of *mādhurya* only in their absence

4 KA I 80 ओज समासभूयस्त्वमेतद् गद्यस्य जीवितम् ।

5 Cp Bhāmaha (I 25 35) who alludes to the term in I 35 he remarks that Gauḍīyā too is good if it is *anākula* (not confused i e clear)

6 The comms Taruṇa Ratna Vidyāsāgara etc (Hṛd however is not clear) explain *guru* and *laghu* (KA I 81) as *mahaprana* and *alpaprāṇa* letters respectively Lahiri (CRG p 76) follows them in this respect But in fact, there is no context of a reference to letters here the words therefore should be connected as adjectives with compounds

long compounds (ii) rarity of long compounds, (iii) moderate number of long compounds (iv) abundance of short compounds (v) smaller quantity of short compounds and lastly (vi) moderate quantity of short compounds The first three forms may be equated with Vamana's *utkalikāprāya* and the last three with his *curna* variety [1] The various forms of *ojas* are observed in prose species like *akhyayikā* etc A typical example of the excellence is as follows पयोधरतटोरसगलग्नसध्यातपांशुका । कस्य कामातुर चेतो वारुणी न करिष्यति ? (I 84)

According to one reading in Bharata *ojas* is the force which consists in the use of varied and dignified compounded words, having letters agreeable to one another while according to the other, it is the structure which imparts loftiness (even if it is low and undignified) and where there is communion of word and sense [2] Bhāmaha describes it as the employment of lengthy compounds,[3] his conception seems to be the result of a wrong interpretation of Dandin's *samāsabhuyastva* which on its part, has its source, with of course some change, in Bharata, quoted as the first reading Vāmana considers it as a verbal *guna* to be the compactness of word structure (*gādhabandhatva*) and, as an ideal *guna*, to be the maturity of conception (*arthapraudhi*) [4] His verbal *guna* partly resembles Dandin's *slesa* which is the absence of laxity while his ideal *guna* is an innovation Bhoja and the author of *Agni Purana* accept Dandin's conception [5] Mammata and Viśvanātha conceive *ojas* as the glaringness (*diptatva*) which causes expansion of heart and which consists in abundant use of compounds, and verbosity [6] They also include *slesa samadhi*, *audarya* and *prasāda* in their conception of *ojas*

9 *Kānti* (grace) is the quality of agreeableness due to conformity to general usage, that is to say, absence of the un

---

1 KASV I 3 24-5 and *vrtti*
2 Cp (a) GOS ed XVI 103 (b) CnSS ed XVII 103
3 Cp BKAl II 2
4 Cp III 1 5 2 2 Bhoja (SKA I 63 f ŚPr IX Josyer ed II p 342) includes *gādhabandhatva* in one of his new *gunas* *a irjitya*
5 Cp SKA I 71 ŚPr IX Josyer ed. II p 342 Agni-P 346 10
6 Cp KPr VIII k 69 75 SD VIII 4 7 9 10 also cp DhA and Loc II 9

natural, the exaggerated or the grotesque, noticeable in (i) dialogues (*vārttas*)[1] and (ii) laudatory speeches (*varnanās*),[2] e g (a) गृहाणि नाम तान्येव तपोराशिर्भवादृशः । सभावयति यान्येव पावनैः पादपांसुभिः ॥ (I 86) (Only those houses indeed deserve to be called as such which a receptacle of penance like your good self honours with the purifying dust of his feet) (b) अनयोरनवद्याङ्गि स्तनयोर्जृम्भमाणयोः । अवकाशो न पर्याप्तस्तव बाहुलतान्तरे ॥ (I 87) (O maiden, with faultless limbs, there is not space enongh between thy creeper like arms for the expansion of these swelling breasts)

In Bharata according to one recension, it is loveliness which delights the ear and the mind or which is realised by the meaning conveyed by graceful gestures, while according to another version, it is the word structure which gives delight (*prasada*) to the ear and the mind[3] In Vāmana, it is as a verbal *guna*, the brilliance or refinedness of words and, as an ideal *guna*, the prominence of sentiment (*diptarasatva*)[4] Bharata's *kānti* according to the first reading appears to be some dramatic excellence a part of it may however, be compared to Dandin s figure, *suksma*[5] The second conception which Vāmana follows in his verbal *guna*, is comparable to Daṇḍin's *madhurya* Vamana s ideal *guna* corresponds to Bharata s conception according to the first reading[6] Bhoja follows Vamana s verbal aspect of the *guna*[7] Daṇḍin s *kanti* is, in a way, the *atiśayokti*

1 Cp Hṛd and Tarkavāgiśa (on I 85) the latter also explains *vārttā* as legendary account the former sense however suits us better Ratna renders it by *pravṛttinivedana* (telling of news) This *vārttā* should not be confused with the figure of that name in Bhaṭṭi (X 45) or Bhāmaha (BKAl II 87) De (HSP II p 86) wrongly takes one for the other

2 Cp Hṛd (on I 85) it may also mean the depiction of the nature of things (cp Ratna) but even then it would b different from Daṇḍin s *svabhāvokti* cp Lahiri CRG pp 78 9

3 Cp (a) GOS ed XVI 112 (b) ChSS ed XVII 107

4 Cp III 1 24 2 14 on the basis of Vāmana s conception of ideal form of *kānti* Viśvanātha (SD VIII 15) includes the *guna* in *rasadhvani* and *gunibhutavyangya*

5 Cp KA II 260 see below ch VII

6 Cp De HSP II p 15 fn

7 SKA I 69 at another place (I 35) he regards *grāmyatva* as the opposite of *kānti* implying thereby that the latter is the absence of vulgarity cp ŚPr IX Josyer ed. II pp 341 & 337 also cp KPr VIII k 72 f

figure[1] with the only difference that while the latter transgresses the worldly usage, the former conforms to it, and, as Hemacandra puts it, it only defines the limit to the *atiśayokti* figure He however, refuses to admit it as a *guṇa* It is to be noted that Appayya Dīkṣita quotes Daṇḍin s example of *kānti* (*varṇana*) as an instance of *atiśayokti*, while the verse which Daṇḍin gives under *atyukti*, the opposite of *kānti*, has been given under the *atyukti* figure by him with the remark that the two figures differ inasmuch as they refer to the real and unreal statements respectively[3] Thus Daṇḍin s *kānti* and its opposite *atyukti* are comparable respectively to *atiśayokti* and *atyukti* figures of later rhetoricians

10 *Samādhi* (metaphorical expression) is the transference, in accordance with the worldly usage, of the quality or qualities of one thing to another,[4] e g , कुमुदानि निमीलन्ति कमलान्युन्मिषन्ति च । (I 94) (The water lilies slumber, the lotuses wake up) Here the quality of the eyes has been transferred to the lilies and lotuses Another example illustrating transference of a number of qualities is as follows गुरुगर्भभराक्लान्ताः स्तनन्त्यो मेघपङ्क्तयः । अचलाधित्यकोत्सङ्गम् इमाः समधिशेरते ॥ (I 98) (The ranges of clouds weary with the weight of advanced pregnancy and moaning from pain sleep on the laps of the mountain)

In Bharata, according to one reading it is superimposition (*samādhāna*) of something special or distinguishing in the sense, and according to the other it is the laboured communion (*atisaṃyoga*) of the sense expressed or implied by simile[5]

---

this *kānti* would resemble Daṇḍin s ideal *mādhurya*

1 KA II 214, cp DhA and Loc III 36 (pp 498 9) cp Sovani *Bhand Com Vol* II pp 397-8

2. Cp KA I 88 II 214 cp KAn p 239 cp De HS II p 97

3 Cp Kuval I 163

4 KA I 93 Acc to Lahiri (CRG pp 80-1) Daṇḍin gives three cases of *samādhi* viz *adhyāsa* (transference of one quality) *gauṇavṛtti* (transference of original sense to the secondary one) and *yugapannaikadharmādhyāsa* (simultaneous transference of a number of qualities) but in fact *adhyāsa* is merely the first stage of *gauṇavṛtti*

5 Cp (a) GOS ed. XVI 102 Abhinavagupta gives a different interpretation of this and tries to equate it with Vāmana s verbal *guṇa* Hemacandra and Māṇikyacandra explain Bharata s definition simply as the

Vāmana describes it, as a verbal *guna*, as symmetry due to orderly ascent and descent, that is when the heightening effect is toned down by the softening touch and *vice versa*, and as an ideal *guna* as pregnancy of, or significance in, the sense (*arthadṛṣṭi*)[1] Dandin's *samādhi* approximates, on one hand, to the *laksana* or *gaunavṛtti* (secondary application of words) and, on the other, to *rupaka* and *samāsokti* figures Its difference from *rupaka* lies in the fact that while it consists in transference of the quality of one *dharmin* to another, in *rupaka* one *dharmin* is superimposed on another In *samasokti* instead of the intended thing, another object similar thereto in attributes is mentioned, whereas in *samādhi*, instead of the real quality of an object, another quality similar thereto is referred to[3] The inspiration of Dandin s *samādhi* comes from Bharata (as in the ChSS ed), though the latter s definition of the *guna* is not so clear Vāmana s verbal *guna* is a new interpretation which Bhoja adopts in *gati* one of his twenty four *vākyagunas* while the ideal aspect of his *guna* is an improvement on Bharata s definition and is comparable to Dandin s *guna* also though he includes the latter s conception of *samādhi* in his *vakrokti* figure[4] Bhoja and the author of *Agni Purāna* follow Dandin in this respect[5]

THE *VIPARYAYAS* OF THE TEN *GUNAS*

As we have already discussed the *anyathatva*[6] (contrariety

superimposition of an object on another quality In Daṇḍin however it is the superimposition of a quality on a different object (b) ChSS ed. XVII 101

1 Cp III 1 12 2 6 for verbal *guna* cp KPr VIII k 72 f

2 He himself refers to *gaunavṛtti* in this context in KA I 95 also cp II 254 Agni-P (345 13 ff) which repeats Daṇḍin s definition of *samādhi* treats it in the context of *lakṣanā* with a hint apparently of identifying the two cp De HSP II p 205

3 Cp also De HSP II pp 81 2 97 acc to V Raghavan (SCAS p 81) the *guna samādhi* produces the figure *samāsokti*

4 Cp KASV IV 3 8

5 Cp SKA I 72 ŚPr IX (Josyer ed. II p 343) Agni-P 345 13 18 Bhoja (SKA IV 44) has a figure also of the same name and definition

6 *Anyathātva* should not imply that the conception of the Gauḍas regarding *gunas* generally differed from that of the Vaidarbhas cp Lahiri CRG pp 58 ff

or the changed condition) of the aforesaid *guṇas* is generally observed in the Gauḍa path It may be recalled that the *viparyayas* do not constitute defects in Daṇḍin's view, though they might not be positive *guṇas* [1] It is worth while to discuss these *viparyayas* with reference to the Gauḍa diction of which they constitute the characteristic elements and thereby determine the concept of the path

1 *Śaithilya* or the laxity of structure is the opposite form of *śleṣa* (I 43) It consists in the employment entirely of the *alpaprāṇa* letters and is tolerable (*iṣṭa*) in the Gauḍa path if it brings about dignity of diction (*bandhagaurava*) through the employment of alliteration, as for instance in मालतीमाला लोलालि-कलिता [2] *Bandhagaurava* is a general quality which resides in the accompaniment of alliteration, or else the existence of *bandha gaurava* in loose structure is inexplicable In fact, laxity of structure is not a quality, nor is it appreciated by the Gauḍas, but it is allowed for the sake of alliteration which accompanies it and which lends dignity to the diction. The verbal grandiosity, or the *akṣaradambara*, as Bāṇa would call it, is favoured by the Gauḍas so much so that they are unmindful of the laxity of diction if it occurs thereby

2. *Vyutpanna*,[3] the opposite of *prasāda*, is far fetchedness due to the employment of vocables in their unconventional, though etymologically justifiable sense, e g. अनत्यर्जुनाब्जन्म-सदृक्षाङ्को वलक्षगुः (I 46) [the white beamed one (i.e moon) has a spot similar to the not very-white water born ones (i e lotuses)]

3 *Viṣama* the *viparyaya* of *sama*, is unevenness or the co-employment of uneven dictions (*bandhas*) which are of three kinds, namely soft, harsh and moderate (I 47) The view of the *Hṛdayaṃgamā* (on I 47 ff) that the soft and harsh dictions were favourite with the Gauḍas (and the middle one with the Vaidarbhas) is untenable, and Ratnasrījñāna has rightly rejected

---

1 It may be noted in passing that Bhoja (SKA I 23-41) describes these opposites as *arītimat* fauls but he also includes them in the *guṇas* of Gauḍa diction (I. 126 ff)

2 Cp KA I. 43-4 also I 69

3 Bhoja (SKA I 34 ŚPr IX, Josyer ed. II p 337) calls it *aprasanna*

it. In their predilection for the bombast both of word and sense as also of poetic figures,[1] the Gauḍas do not mind unevenness if it creeps in In other words, they would allow it, provided it enhances the charm of poetic diction as for instance in (मलयमारुत:) । स्पर्धते रुद्धमद्धैर्यो वररामाननानिलैः ॥ (I 49) (The Malaya breeze which has impeded my patience vies with the breath of the beautiful lady) The verse illustrates the pomp of simile and alliteration due to which fact the defect of unevenness (that is, harsh *bandha* in the first line and soft one in the second) has been allowed It may be noted here that Vāmana's verbal *guṇa*, *samādhi* closely resembles the idea of *viṣama*

4 *Niṣṭhura*, the *viparyaya* of *sukumāratā* is the use of harsh sounds which are difficult to pronounce It is preferred by the Gauḍas for its being grand or glaring and embellished[2] The example is न्यक्षेण क्षपितः पक्षः क्षत्रियाणां क्षणात् (I 72) Such *bandhas* are accepted by the Gauḍas on account of the glaring sense (*ūrjita artha*) and alliteration they contain (I 71-2)

5 *Atyukti* the *viparyaya* of *kānti*[3] is the exaggerated expression which crosses the limit of worldly usage, e g (*vārttā*) देवधिष्ण्यम् इवाराध्यम् अद्यप्रभृति नो गृहम् । युष्मत्पादरजःपातधौतनिःशेषकल्मषम् ॥ (I 90) (From today our house is to be adored as a temple, since the dust of your feet has entirely washed away all its sins) (*varṇanā*) अल्पं निर्मितम् आकाशम् अनालोच्यैव वेधसा । इदम् एवंविधं भावि भवत्याः स्तनजृम्भणम् ॥ (I 91) (Surely the Creator has made this space too narrow foreseeing not so great an expansion of thy breasts)

The remaining five *guṇas* are according to Taruṇavācaspati's interpretation of *prāyo dṛśyate* accepted in the same

---

1 Bhoja (SKA I 127) interprets Daṇḍin's phrase, *artha-alaṃkāraḍambara* as ideal figures and verbal flamboyance. We may however take it to signify bombast of both word and sense and poetic figures as well also cp. Krishna Chaitanya SP p 104

2 Cp KA I 72, also I 71

3 KA I 89-92. Vāmana ascribes *kānti* itself (which he explains as *ujjvala* [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
name cp. above.

form in the Gauda diction [1] This is also clear from Dandin's own admission to that effect As a matter of fact, these five *gunas* are accepted by the Gaudas with certain specifications in some cases They require, therefore, a separate reference in the context of the Gauda diction

1 The verbal *mādhurya* or *vāgrasa* consists of *srutyanuprāsa* and *varnānuprāsa*[2] (termed simply *anuprasa*) which have been separately alluded to by the author with the remark that the former is favoured by the Vaidarbhas, while the Gaudas prefer the latter to the former [3] *Varnānuprasa* according to him is the recurrence of letters very close to one another and giving the impression of previous occurrence (I 52) It may be remarked here that the Gaudas would not like the alliteration with repetition of letters after long gaps The ideal *mādhurya* or *vasturasa* is the absence of indecency which gets admission into both the dictions

2 *Arthavyakti* is accepted by the Gaudas in the same form in which the Vaidarbhas adopt it (I 75)

3 *Udaratva*, too, is a *guna* common to both, or even all, the *mārgas* (I 76)

4 *Ojas* or *samāsa bhuyastva* is acceptable in the Gauda diction in verse also, while it is appreciated in prose only by the Vaidarbhas (I 80, 83) The *guna* in its extreme form is a special characteristic of the Gauda diction and the fact has been admitted by Vāmana also, though his conception of *ojas* is quite different He has, however, recognised Dandin s *ojas* also by describing Gaudi as a diction characterised by the abundance of

---

1 Cp comm on I 42 also cp Ratna

2 Cp Hemacandra KAn NSP ed p 198

3 Cp KA I 54 60 Taruna regards both the *anuprasas* as acceptable to both the dictions but remarks that Vaidarbha *mārga* does not permit the alliteration which causes harshness and laxity of diction (cp KA I 60 Ranga ed p 37) this however is admissible in the Gauda *mārga* due to the recurrence of letters only SKA (I 36) cites the ex. KA I 59 under *asamasta fault the opposite of ojas also cp ŚPr IX, Josyer ed* II pp 337 8 in this form it should not have been acceptable to the Gaudas also cp also Lahiri CRG pp 69-70

compounds and verbosity (*samastātyudbhaṭapada*)[1] An apt example of *ojas* of the Gaudas is the verse ग्रस्तमस्तकपर्यस्तसमस्ता कीर्गुमस्तरा । पीनस्तनस्थितातास्रवस्त्रैवाभाति वारुणी ॥[2] The author makes a hint to the effect that the *ojas* of the Gaudas is confusing and hence unpleasant[3] This attitude seems to represent his personal viewpoint which preferred the Vaidarbha diction to the other one

5 The *guna samādhi* has been regarded as the essence of poetry (*kāvyasarvasva*) with the implication that it is appreciated not only in the two clearly distinguishable dictions, but in all the possible literary paths[4]

The foregoing discussion brings out the following features of the Gauḍa *marga* (i) The ten *gunas* are essential in any good composition but the Gauḍa path often represents a different aspect of some of them (ii) The ideals of composition differ generally in the two dictions While the Vaidarbha path emphasises the refined and classical manner and demands compactness of structure clarity of expression and a sense of proportion, the Gauḍa path prefers the elements of hyperbole and verbosity (iii) In order to achieve this object, the Gauḍas do not mind the defects of looseness and unevenness though it is never meant that the above defects form inseparable part of the Gauḍa path iv) Far fetchedness exaggeration etc, however, are regarded as positive excellences by the Gauḍas who often welcome them in poetry in order to attain the standard which has a distinct liking for the fervid and the grandiose Vamana s Gauḍiyā *riti* is characterised by the excellences *ojas*, comprising the elements of compactness of structure and maturity of meaning and *kanti* composed of brilliance and prominence of *rasa* He also calls it a diction marked by profusion of compounds and verbal display Visvanātha's Gauḍī *riti* also is particularised by the abundance

1 KASV I 2 12 and *vṛtti*

2 Bhoja (SKA II ex 189) *cites this vers und r his Paundri vrt ti (Pundra = Gauḍadeśa)*

3 Cp KA I 83 प्रय त्वनाकुल हृद्यमिच्छन्त्योजो गिरा यथा ।

4 KA I 100 Hṛd takes *kāvyasarvasva* to imply that the *guna* is common to the two paths We however like to take it in its wid r application of all dictions that is a poetic composition in general

P. G.

of compounds [1]

AN ASSESSMENT OF DANDIN'S TREATMENT OF *GUNAS*

Judging independently of the treatment of diction Dandin's elaboration of the *gunas* is not exhaustive and strictly logical The definitions of some of them are not very much clear The *gunas*, *udāratva* and *kānti*, for example have been defined vaguely Although in both of them the author evidently admits the subjective evaluation, yet he does not care to make this fact clear in his definition [2] Again, the definition of *kānti* appears to be incomplete, for while the agreeable sense within the limit of the worldly usage has a very wide range which may cover many things, an examination of the illustrations clearly show that the writer means to restrict the scope only to the expression of something special, which is in fact a part of the definition of the figure, *atiśayokti* The position of *madhurya* also is not better It has been regarded as an excellence both of word and sense, but there is no correlation between the verbal and the ideal *mādhurya* One can understand the existence of verbal *madhurya* in an alliterative composition, but the idea of the *necessary* existence of sweetness of sense in the absence of vulgarity is not apprehensible, and S K De rightly remarks that the *guna mādhurya* though defined primarily as a particular mode of word-arrangement has been regarded more or less as a subtle excel lence which defies analysis [3] Again some of the *gunas* which evidently contain positive characteristics have been given nega tive definitions There can be the least doubt that the *gunas*, *sleṣa*, *sukumārata* and *arthavyakti* are positive excellences, but they have been negatively defined This has been done probably in order to achieve more clearness but this could very well be secured by positive definitions also

Although on the whole, the author has improved upon the definitions of Bharata, it must be admitted that in some cases he has obscured the real conception of a *guna* by providing it with an entirely different interpretation, and thereby has given

1 Also see above ch III

2 Cp also De HSP II p 81

3 Cp De *loc cit*

rise to certain problems His exposition of *samatā* would illustrate this point Herein he admits the soft harsh and middle *bandhas* arising respectively from the use of soft harsh and mixed letters, in both the *mārgas* The admission, however, is incompatible with the author s own statement that the soft diction contains the defect of looseness of *bandha* and that it is, for this reason not admissible in the Vaidarbha *mārga*[1] The soft *bandha* may be supposed to be acceptable to the Vaidarbhas due to its being *soft*, but the acceptability of the harsh *bandha* which contains the indefensible defect of being difficult to pronounce' (*kṛcchrodyatva*) in the Vaidarbha diction is beyond comprehension In fact the two *bandhas* containing as they do the defect of looseness (in being all soft) and that of being difficult to pronounce respectively, ought not to be admitted in the Vaidarbha path The question drew the attention of the old commentators According to the *Hṛdayamgamā* the soft and harsh *bandhas* are appreciated by the Gauḍas and the middle one by the Vaidarbhas[3] Refuting this explanation Ratnasrijñana remarks that the soft and harsh *bandhas* are noticeable in standard Vaidarbha works like *Raghuvamsa* and *Jatakamalā* composed by southern writers The explanation is of course, not fully convincing and is acceptable only partially In fact Bharata s definition of *samatā* (ChSS ed) is the appropriate exposition of the *guna* and by changing it Dandin has merely given rise to confusion His definition of the *gunas* *mādhurya* and *kānti* also cannot be considered to be better than that given by Bharata

The second flaw in Daṇḍin s treatment of the excellences is that some of his *gunas* have not been clearly distinguished from each other The distinction between *sleṣa* and *sukumarata* for instance is not very much clear According to the definitions *sleṣa* consists in the abundant use of *alpaprāna* letters, while *sukumarata* is composed of soft syllables As the *alpaprana* letters are generally soft the difference between the two *gunas* is

1 Cp KA I 69 the ex (I 43) of soft *bandha* is closely comparable to that of *śaithilya* (I 43) which is not acceptable to the Vaidarbhas.

2. Cp the example I 48 with I 72 which is called *kṛcchrodya*

3 Cp the comm. on KA I 47

practically nil Besides the absolute absence of the *mahāprāna* and harsh letters respectively in the two *gunas* results in the same defect, namely, *bandhaśaithilya* or laxity of diction The commentator Tarkavāgīśa tries to distinguish the two by stating that the admixture of *alpaprana* and *mahāprāna* letters constitutes *slesa* whereas *sukumāratā* consists in tenderness as a total effect arising from the mixing of soft and harsh letters He further clarifies the fact by adding that the *alpaprāna* letters are not necessarily soft, they tend to become harsh in conjunction with certain letters, and similarly the *mahāprāna* letters too, become soft in their particular arrangement [1] But it should be borne in mind that Dandin himself has admitted the *alpaprana* letters to be soft by saying that the use entirely of *alpaprāna* letters constitutes *all softness* [2] The *gunas*, *prasāda* and *artha vyakti* also have got too much mutual affinity, and as S K De remarks, the latter may well be included in the former [3] Both the *gunas* aim at easy comprehension (*pratitisubhagata*), the difference lying only in the means thereof While in *prasāda* the aim is realised by the use of words easy of comprehension, that in the other *guna* is achieved by means of the explicitness of sense The author was perhaps aware of the defective nature of the classification which he has hinted at towards the end of his treatment of *gunas* [4]

Some of the *gunas* tend to enter the jurisdiction of certain poetic figures, and have been specifically treated as such by later theorists The verbal aspect of *mādhurya* has been called *anuprāsa*, a poetic figure of word by the author himself The *guna udārata* is very close in conception to the *udatta* figure P C Lahiri differentiating between the two, remarks that in the figure, the greatness, high merit or prosperity of a personage is described directly, while in the excellence it is just implied [5] Evidently the point of difference, especially when it is between a *guna* and an *alamkara* is quite negligible Moreover, we do

1 Cp above cp Lahiri CRG p 72
2 KA I 69 also cp above
3 HSP II p 81
4 KA I 101 2
5 Cp CRG p 75 fn

not notice the element of implicitness in the example of *udāratva*[1] The *guna kanti*, likewise, bears a close affinity, within a limit, to the *atisayokti* figure In both the cases, there is expression of something special, though not clearly mentioned by the author in the context of the *guna* The expression of the special restricts itself, in the *guna*, to the worldly usage, while in the figure it transgresses the limit As noted above, Hemacandra clearly states that the *guna* borders on the *atisayokti* figure and Appaya Dikṣita virtually identifies Dandin's *kanti* with *atiśayokti* and *atyukti* (the opposite of the *guna*) with the figure of that name[2]

Similarly it is difficult to distinguish the excellence *samādhi* from the figure *rupaka* where there is also poetic super imposition of an object or its qualities upon another, a slight difference may consist in the fact that in the *guna* there is transference only of the qualities or actions of one thing to another, while in the figure, one object itself is substituted for another But in fact, this process of poetic transference is essentially a mode of figurative expression resting finally on *lakṣanā* (secondary application of meaning)[3] Vāmana, too, regards it as a figure in the form of *laksana* based on similarity, though he terms it *vakrokti* and not *rupaka*[4] The *guna* is comparable to the figure *samāsokti* also the only point of difference between the two being that the *guna* instead of referring to the real quality of an object mentions some other quality similar thereto while in the figure the poet instead of referring to the intended object mentions another object close thereto[5]

When *gunas* are regarded as the essential or constituent elements of the *marga* it is natural to expect that they present

---

1 Lahiri (*op cit*) himself remarks that it need not mean any technical suggestiveness of the *dhvani* theorists

2. Cp (a) KAn p 259 (b) Kuval I 163

3 Cp De HSP II pp 81 2

4 Cp IV 3 8 its example is closely comparable to Dandin s example of *samādhi* (KA I 94)

5 V Raghavan (SCAS p 81) remarks that the *guna samādhi* produces the figure *samāsokti*

a positive aspect But in the case of ideal *mādhurya*, we observe that its existence is due to the absence of the defect of indecency and thus it represents a negative form In fact, the inevitable residence of *mādhurya* in the absence of vulgarity is not possible unless there exists already some positive element conducive to sweetness This positive element can either be the emotion of love (as is indicated by Dandin's example I 64) which according to him should be alluded to in decently-worded phrases, or the strikingness of expression which forms the ideal *mādhurya* in Vāmana

Although Daṇḍin does not classify the *gunas* into those of word and sense, nor perhaps was he aware of this distinction,[1] an examination of his *gunas* shows that some of them refer to word, some to sense, while one of them refers to both The excellences *ślesa samatā, sukumāratā* and *ojas* which refer to sound effects and word arrangement constitute what may be called verbal *gunas*, while *prasāda arthavyakti, udaratva, kanti* and *samādhi* come under the ideal excellences The *guna, madhurya* refers both to word and sense [2]

Notwithstanding some inevitable flaws in Dandin's treatment of the *gunas* it must be admitted that he has in his own way considerably improved upon the vague definitions of Bharata and, by introducing novel features at places, has exhibited his creative and critical mind In fact, the topic dealing with the *gunas* remains defective in the whole range of Sanskrit Poetics in general and in the works of early theorists in particular, and indicates the fruitlessness of their efforts 'in comprehending all the excellences of a composition within the hard and fast limits of a few categories on the interpretation of which they spend so much ingenuity but on which cannot in the nature of things arrive at any absolute agreement [3] We must make our estimate of Daṇḍin s treatment of the subject in the light of the above fact

1 The distinction is vaguely hinted at in the solitary case of *mādhurya* which the writer says resides both in word and idea (I 51)

2 Cp also De HSP II p 82 Lahiri CRG p 84

3 S K De HSP II p 98

CHAPTER V

THE *DOSA* DOCTRINE OF DANDIN

CONCEPTION OF *DOṢAS*

The treatment of *dosas* or the literary defects forms an important part of Sanskrit Poetics and especially of the *marga* doctrine from the very beginning and it has succeeded in drawing the attention of Daṇḍin more than once [1] According to him a literary aspirant should not overlook even the slightest flaw in poetry, because, as he remarks, it annuls the beauty of otherwise a good piece of poetry just as a spot of white leprosy mars the charm of even a lovely form [2] Abhinavagupta emphasises this fact by remarking that a *kāvya* even if it is devoid of poetic excellences and figures, is acceptable if it is just free from defects [3] The first element of the definition of poetry in Bhoja and Mammata is the condition of its being free from flaws[4] on the avoidance of which the former evidently puts special emphasis by discussing the *dosas* first of all in his work Thus according to Dandin as well as the later theorists the avoidance of defect in poetry is as essential as the employment of the *gunas* [5]

Daṇḍin like Bharata, does not define *dosa* perhaps due to its being too clear a concept to explain However according to him anything that is employed improperly or indecently and for that reason perturbs the mind of a man of taste (*sahṛdaya*) constitutes a defect [6] And this attitude of his as also his ana-

---

1 Cp KA I 8 20 II 51 56 III 186 187 etc. the III 125-85 is exclusively devoted to the topic.

2. KA I 7 तदल्पमपि नोपेक्ष्यं काव्ये दुष्टं कदाचन। स्याद्वपुः सुन्दरमपि श्वित्रेणैकेन दुर्भगम् ॥, also cp above refs

3 Cp AB on BNS (GOS ed.) XVI 95

4 SKA I 2 KPr I 4 also cp Vāgbhaṭa (I) *Vāgbhaṭālaṁkāra* II 5

5 Also cp BKAl I 11 KASV I 1 3

6. Cp KA I 6 7 II 51 also cp I 20

lysis of the *doṣas* which according to him are of transient nature with prospects of becoming excellences in different contexts show that he admits some kind of subjective element in the concept. He does not regard *doṣas* as absolute entities, he analyses them from the functional point of view and according to this analysis, his conception of defect closely approximates to the later concept of *anaucitya* (impropriety) which also is determined by the poetic context. But since he takes, like other earlier writers an objective view of poetry and its aesthetic value his *doṣas* chiefly refer to the body of poetry and do not contain *that* subjective element which was attributed to the concept by the theorists who came after the establishment of the *dhvani* theory. The beauty of poetry in these later writers assumed a subjective form and the position of *doṣas* also changed accordingly. They were related primarily to the soul and through its relation were just secondarily, connected with the body of poetry the word and sense. Thus when *doṣa* came to be linked with *rasa*, the soul it began to be defined as that which hindered the enjoyment thereof[1]. The doctrine developed along with the doctrine of *guṇa* of which it formed the counterpart and was considered from the standpoint of *rasa*. In fact, the difference among the various theorists in the conception of *doṣa* was the result of their different viewpoints with regard to the conception of poetry. The basic position of *doṣa* in relation to poetry remained unchanged, as in earlier writers it continued to be viewed as an offensive to the charm of poetry[2].

Daṇḍin is silent on the question whether the *doṣas* are positive elements or mere negations of the *guṇas*. According to Bharata the *guṇas* signify the absence of *doṣas*, so that the latter are positive entities from which the former, their negative forms, are known by implication[3]. From Daṇḍin's independent treatment of the *doṣas*, it is evident that he regards them as positive elements but at the same time, he never conceives the *guṇas* as their negations. In fact, both the elements form separate

1 Cp Mammaṭa KPr VII k 49 Viśvanātha SD VII 1
2. Cp Nagendra HKAS intro pp 81 3
3 BNS XVII 96

entities in his scheme Vamana's standpoint is peculiar in this respect he goes directly against the opinion of Bharata and expressly makes the *gunas* positive elements defining the *dosas* as their opposites [1] Rudrata recognises independent status of the two Later, in the *dhvani* system, they were no longer absolute entities but attributes or absence of attributes relating to the development of *rasa* The later opinion regarding the respective character of poetic excellences and defects appears to be that some *dosas* approximate to the absence of excellence while some excellences approach the condition of the absence of a defect [2] In Dandin s treatment also we observe this position accorded to some of the *gunas* and *dosas* The ideal *mādhurya*, for instance is the negation of the defect of indecency and on the other hand there are some *dosas* alluded to in the context of the *gunas* which are negative forms of the latter

Danḍin considers the defects in poetry to be of transient nature, for according to him, they may turn into excellences under certain different circumstances He analyses the *doṣas* with the qualification that they either become excellences or at least cease to be defects in certain changed conditions If the view made its appearance in Danḍin for the first time, as the case seems to be, it must be regarded as his important original contribution to the doctrine of *dosa* Following him, Bhāmaha and others also hold that with the change of conditions *doṣas* become *gunas* [3] On the basis of this principle, Bhoja has given a new set of *doṣas* called *vaiseṣikas* which are in fact temporary faults He has in this respect developed the basic principle of Danḍin whom he has also profusely cited in this connection [4]

THE TEN *DOṢAS* OF DANḌIN

Following Bharata with regard to the number, Danḍin enumerates ten *doṣas* which though inspired by Bharata s line

---

1 Cp II 1 1 गुणविपर्ययात्मानो दोषाः ।
2 Cp De HSP II p 88 fn
3 Cp BKAI I 54-5 also VJ II 2 AB on BNS (GOS ed) XVI 95 KMim GOS ed p 112 KPr VII k 59 f SD VII 16-32 also cp Krishna Chaitanya SP pp 73-4 203
4 Cp SKA I 89-156 also cp ŚPr IX (Josyer ed II pp 340-41)

of thought, do not fully agree with his list as also with his conception of some of them Only three *doṣas* of Daṇḍin in name and substance and other five in substance only correspond to Bharata s *doṣas* Bharata's first *doṣa*, *gudhartha* is absent in Daṇḍin, though it can be observed in his negation of *prasada* Likewise, the first variety of Bharata s *bhinnārtha* (*grāmya*) may be traced in the opposite of his ideal *mādhurya* On the other hand he introduces two new *doṣas* namely, *apakrama* and *yatibhraṣṭa*, the latter of which can very well be included in the scope of *bhinnavṛtta*

We give below a comparative study of the ten *doṣas* dealt with by Daṇḍin

1 *Apārtha* is the absence of complete sense resulting from non-satisfaction of the natural expectancy of words (*ākāṅkṣā*) in a sentence (III 128) The defect ceases to be as such in the utterances of insane people drunken and children [1] The *doṣa* can be traced back to Bharata s *abhiplutārtha* the example of which given by Abhinavagupta is comparable to one in the *Kāvyādarsa* [2] It also corresponds to some extent, to the later sentential defect, *abhavanmatasambandha* or the want of harmony between the ideas to be expressed and the words expressing them [3]

2 *Vyartha* is incongruity with the context either in a sentence or in a composition permissible only in the mental state of deep engrossment (III 131) The *doṣa* bears a resemblance to Bharata s *arthahina* [4] In Mammaṭa and Viśvanātha it is a defect of sense, named *vyahatatva* [5]

3 *Ekārtha* is tautology either in words or in sense (III 135) It becomes an excellence in the expression of emotions like excessive pathos and fear etc [6] The *doṣa* evidently comes from Bharata who gives it an identical name, while in later theorists it has been recognised as *punarukta* which term makes

1 Cp KA III 128 also cp BKAl I 54-5
2 Cp BNS GOS ed XVI 92 and AB thereon with KA III 123 9
3 KPr VII k 54 f SD VII 7
4 BNS GOS ed XVI 90
5 KPr VII k 55 f, SD VII 9
6 KA III 137 also cp BKAl IV 14

its unconscious appearance in Daṇḍin [1]

4 *Sasaṃśaya* is ambiguity when certainty of meaning is warranted (III 139) It however, becomes an embellishment when ambiguity is meaningful (III 141) The *doṣa* finds a place in Bharata in the form of *saṃdigdha* a variety of *bhinnartha* [2] It was recognised by later theorists as a defect both of word and sense [3]

5 *Apakrama* is the violation of syntactical order, it occurs when the order of a number of things describ d is not observed in the following sequence (III 144) It ceases to be a *dosa* when the sequence is broken for the indication of peculiar connection between certain things (III 146) The *dosa* is absent in Bharata In later writers it appears as *duskrama* a defect of sense, and *akrama*, a sentential flaw [4]

6 *Śabdahīna* is the grammatical error which is allowed, to some extent to occur in the works of poets who are generally slow at observing the subtle rules of the science of words (III 148 151) The *dosa* comes from Bharata who terms it also *śabdacyuta* [5] In later writers, it assumes the names *asādhu aprayuktatva* and *cyutasaṃskāratā* etc [6]

7 *Yatibhrasta* is the breach of rules of metrical pause permissible in case it is not unpleasant to the ear (III 152) The fault may well be included in the scope of *visama* of Bharata or in Daṇḍin s own *bhinnavṛtta* Mammaṭa calls it *yatibhangad aśravyatva* and gives it as a variety of *hatavṛtta* [7]

8 *Bhinnavṛtta* is deviation from the prosodical rules that is, the use of syllables more or less than the required number and of long or short syllables in the wrong place in a metre (III 156) Bharata called it *visama* while in later theorists it

---

1 Cp BNS GOS ed XVI 92 KPr VII 55 SD VII 5 (*vākyadoṣa*) and 12 (*artha-*) for the term *punarukta* cp KA III 137 in ASK (pp 34 207) however it appears in a conscious form also BKAI IV 12
2 GOS ed. XVI 90
3 KPr VII k 51 56 ff SD VII 2 10
4 KPr VII k 55 SD VII 7 9
5 GOS ed. XVI 88 94
6 Cp KASV II 1 5 KPr VII k 50 SD VII 2 4 etc
7 KPr VII k 53 f also cp SD VII 5 *vṛtti*

appeared as *hatavṛtta*, a sentential defect [1]

9 *Visamdhika* is the absence of euphonic combination when it is necessary (III 159) Bharata has *doṣa* named *visamdhi* and has defined it as *anupaśliṣṭaśabda* which Abhinavagupta seems to regard as want of compactness Mammata has a sentential defect of this name and Viśvanātha adopts it as *samdhiviśleṣa* [2]

10 *Deśakalakalalokanyāyāgamavirodhi* is the inconsistency with regard to (i) place (ii) time (iii) the fine arts (iv) worldly usage, (v) logic and (vi) scriptures (the *śrutis* along with the *smṛtis*) [4] The defect turns into an excellence by the skill of the poet, as has been illustrated by the author in detail (III 179 85) Bharata has a *doṣa* named *nyayād apeta*[5] which is comparable to Daṇḍin's *nyayavirodhi* The later *dosas* like *prasiddhiviruddhatā*, *vidyā-* and *deśa-* are inspired by the different aspects of this *doṣa* of Daṇḍin [6]

Besides these ten *dosas*, Daṇḍin refers to an eleventh *dosa*, namely, *pratijñahetudṛṣṭantahani*, faulty logical proposition middle term and logical illustration Whether or not it is a *dosa* was a matter of controversy and considering the discussion of the question to be of no value, Daṇḍin discards it (III 127) Since the *dosa* can well be incorporated in the *nyāya virodhi*, a part of the last *doṣa*, its separate mention is not at all warranted, and Daṇḍin is right in rejecting it as a *dosa*

From Daṇḍin s treatment of *doṣas* it is evident that he was greatly influenced by the tradition of Bharata, but in his elaborate discussion he is certainly far more advanced than his predecessor He does not classify the *doṣas* on the basis of word and sense, though he has divided *ekartha* into two forms on the above basis In later theorists, the word and sense

1 BNS GOS ed XVI 93, KPr VII k 53 SD VII 5
2 BNS GOS ed XVI 94 and AB thereon
3 KPr VII k 53 SD VII 6
4 KA III 162-4 Bhāmaha (BKA IV 47) explains *śrutis* as *dharma śāstras* and the worldly limits set therein
5 Cp GOS ed XVI 93
6 KPr VII k 56-7 SD VII 10 SKA I ex 66 ŚPr IX Josyer ed II pp 339-40

formed the main basis of classification of the *dosas,* hinted at for the first time in Dandin His defects *apārtha, vyartha, sasamśaya apakrama* and *-virodhi* are related to the meaning of a sentence, while the defects *śabdahīna, yatibhrasṭa bhinna vṛtta* and *visamdhika* refer to sentence or series of words *Ekārtha* may be linked both with word and sense But the writer pays little attention to this principle which we find elaborated for the first time in the work of Vāmana who, along with other later writers develops the *doṣas* into two broad categories, those of word and sense

The *dosas* of Daṇḍin were adopted in the same form by Bhāmaha though there is a slight difference in the exposition of some of them [1] The main ground of controversy is the eleventh *dosa* rejected by Dandin but emphatically asserted as a *dosa* and treated in detail in a separate chapter by Bhāmaha [2] Vamana divides the *dosas* into four classes of words the mean ing of words sentence and the meaning of a sentence [3] Some of the defects of Vamana who has tried to adjust almost all the *dosas* of Daṇḍin in his elaborate scheme bear a clear stamp of his influence [4] Rudrata also follows the same principle of classification and many of his *doṣas* come directly from Daṇḍin s tradition [5] Bhoja treats the ten *doṣas* of Daṇḍin along with a host of others in the form of the defects of sentence and those of its meaning For his treatment of these ten *doṣas,* he is mainly indebted to Dandin [6] In the post-*dhvani* period when

---

1 Cp BKAI IV 1–2 (the enumeration of the *doṣas*) which are identical with KA III 125 6 except the fourth line which in Bhāmaha puts forth the eleventh *doṣa pratyjñāhetu ḍṛṣṭāntahīna* the definition of *apārtha* is alike in both (cp KA III 128 with BKAI IV 8), while *vyartha ekārtha* and *bhinnavṛtta* etc also are similar in many points cp KA III 131 136 and 156 with BKAI IV 9 16 and 25 respectively

2 BKAI V 1–69 the topic was interesting to Bhāmaha a logician from the view point of the logic in poetry

3 Cp KASV II 1 1 to II 2 24

4 Cp his *asādhu (śabdahīna) bhinnavṛtta yatibhraṣṭa visamdhi vyartha ekārtha samdigdha apakrama lokavirud dha* and *vidy ā-* with corres ponding *doṣa* in Daṇḍin

5 Cp esp his *visamdhi apahetu nirāgama asambaddha* etc

6 Cp SKA I 3–58 he deals with 57 *doṣas* in all his *arītimat* (or *guṇa*

the suggestion of *rasa* was established as the soul of poetry, a new set of *dosas*, called *rasa-dosas*, appeared on the scene [1] The essence of the treatment of *dosas* in the later period we notice in Mammata who deals with seventy defects in all, thirty-seven *dosas* being related to word, twenty three to sense and ten to *rasa* [2]

DOṢAS CONCEIVED AS NEGATIONS OF THE *GUṆAS*

Besides the traditional *dosas* which may be termed external ones, Daṇḍin has indirectly referred to some *dosas* in the first chapter of his *Kāvyādarsa* as negative forms of the *gunas* excepting *udāratva ojas* and *samādhi* the opposites of which have not been alluded to by him The *dosas* thus referred to are as follows

1 *Śithila* (looseness), the opposite of *slesa*, consists in the exclusive employment of unaspirate letters e g मालतीमाला लोलालिकलिला (I 43) [3]

2 *Vyutpanna* the opposite of *prasāda* consists in the use of words in their derivative meaning which is not conventionalised and hence which makes the expression difficult of comprehension [4]

3 *Visama* (unevenness) the opposite of *sama* is the want of evenness in the employment of different *bandhas*, that is, the mixture of soft harsh and middling dictions (I 47-50)

4 *Grāmya* (indecency), the opposite of ideal *mādhurya*, is contained either in the sense or in the word, e g (in sense) कन्ये कामयमानं मां न त्वं कामयसे कथम् (I 63) (Girl why do you not

---

viparyaya acc. to ŚPr IX Josyer ed. II pp 337-8) *dosas* have been obviously inspired by Daṇḍin see below In ŚPr (IX Josyer ed. II pp 333–40) he deals with 43 *dosas* in three sets of *pada*, *vākya* and *vākyārtha* the *guna-viparyaya* being one of the *vākyadosas*

1 Cp DhA III 17 9 and *vrtti* (pp 395 ff) KPr VII k. 60 ff SD VII. 12-⁵ also cp Mahimabhaṭṭa Kṣemendra etc.

2 KPr VII For a detailed history of the concept, see V Raghavan ŚPr pp 20⁷–48 also cp Nagendra intro to HKAS pp 81 96

3 Cp with this Bhāmaha s ex of *grāmyānuprāsa* स लोलमालानीलालिकुलाकुलगलो बल (BKAL II. 6) and Udbhata s ex. of *grāmyavrtti* केलिलालालिमालाना कले कोलाहले क्वचित् (KASS I. 11)

4 Cp KA I 46 also see above ch IV (the *viparyayas* of *gunas*)

love me who covet you?) (in word) the use of √*yabh* 'to have sexual intercourse' or *ni*√*sthīv* 'to spit'. Indecency also arises from a particular word-combination or is suggested in a particular sentence: e.g. (word-combination) या भवतः प्रिया (I. 66) (one who is your love) which tends to suggest याभवतः प्रिया (beloved of one in coition) (sentence) खरं प्रहृत्य विश्रान्तः पुरुषो वीर्यवान् (I. 67) [The strong man (Rāma) was tired after killing Khara] which suggests the sense that the lusty fellow is tired after playing hard in coition. Bharata recognises this *doṣa* as a variety of *bhinnārtha*.

5. *Dīpta* or *niṣṭhura*, the opposite of *sukumāratā*, occurs due to the exclusive employment of harsh sounds which are difficult to pronounce (I. 69-72). In later theory the defect appears as *śrutikaṭu* or *duḥśrava*.[1]

6. *Neyatva* (implicitness), the opposite of *arthavyakti*, consists in the non-explicitness of sense: e.g. मही महावराहेण लोहितादुद्धृतोदधेः (The earth was lifted up by Viṣṇu in his Boar incarnation from the ocean which was red—) where *uragāsṛjā* (—with the blood of the serpents crushed under his feet) is implied and has to be brought in to make the sense complete (I. 73-4).

7. *Atyukti* is the opposite of *kānti*, the exaggeration herein being beyond the scope of worldly usage (I. 89-92).

The followers of the Vaidarbha path consider these elements to be defects in poetry. In the Gauḍa path also they are defects (excepting *dīpta* and *atyukti*) though the Gauḍas would allow them in poetry if there is dignity of diction or grandiosity of sense and poetic embellishment.[2] The opinion of S. K. De therefore that Daṇḍin takes the essential faults as negations of some of the *guṇas* of the Vaidarbha *mārga* and consequently as positive characteristics of the Gauḍa *mārga*[3] is only partially correct.

On the inspiration of these negative *doṣas* Bhāmaha prepares his second list of defects which includes the above *doṣas* of Daṇḍin with a few alterations and additions. Thus among

1. Cp. KPr VII. p. 50; SD VII. 2
2. KA I. 44, 50; also cp. above ch. IV
3. HSP II, p. 87

his six general *dosas*[1] *neyārtha* (far fetchedness) takes its inspiration from Daṇḍin s *neyatva* though it has been some what differently conceived The faults *klisṭa* (obscure sense), *anyārtha* (disappearance of sense) and *avacaka* (inexpressiveness) have been developed probably from the *vyutpanna* of Daṇḍin The *ayuktimat* (illogical) is another form of *nyāyavirodhi* and the *gudhasabdabhidhāna* (use of obscure expressions) resembles Bharata s *gūḍhartha*[2] Of his four defects of speech *srutidusṭa* (explicitly indecent) *arthadusṭa* (implicitly indecent) and *kalpanādusṭa* (indecent in the alliance of two words) are evidently the different forms of Daṇḍin s *grāmya* while the last *srutikasṭa* (harsh in sound) corresponds to Daṇḍin s *dīpta* or *krcchrodya*[3] Vamana also derives inspiration from Daṇḍin in his treatment of the *dosas* and appropriates some of his negative defects[4] His verbal defects *kasṭa grāmya* and *apratīta* are closely comparable to Daṇḍin s *dīpta grāmya* and *vyutpanna* respectively[5] In later Poetics these *dosas* were adopted in different forms by the theorists[6] of whom it was Bhoja who owes to Daṇḍin the most He gives the opposites of all the *gunas* of Daṇḍin except *samādhi* under what he calls the *ayuktimat dosas* These negative forms closely follow Daṇḍin s terms and conceptions He has however, *kaṭhora* (or *asukumāra*) for *dīpta* and *aprasanna* for *vyutpanna* he takes *grāmya* to be the opposite of *kānti* and not of *mādhurya* which has *anirvyūḍha* (or *atinyudha*) for its opposite he drops the *ayukti* of Daṇḍin and has *asamasta* and

1 BKAl I 37 ff

2 BNS XVII 88 ff

3 BKAl I 47 ff KA I 62, 72 the examples of Bhamaha (I 50–2) are comparable to Daṇḍin s (I 63 65–7)

4 Vāmana in his view that the *doṣas* are the negations of *gunas* (II 1 1) appears to have been inspired by faults conceived as the negations of *gunas* in Daṇḍin. For his treatment of *doṣas* cp KASV II chs. 1–2

5 Cp Vāmana KASV II 1 6–8 though the direct impress on his *vakyar kalpas* seems to be that of Bhāmaha an indirect influence of Daṇḍin cannot be denied

6. Cp Mammaṭa s *srutikaṭutva grāmya neyārtha klisṭa avimṛṣṭavidheyāṃśa* (KPr VII 50–7) and Visvanātha s *grāmyatva* (*pada* and *artha*) *duṣkaratva kasṭārthatva neyārthatva* (SD VII 2–12) which are traceable to Daṇḍin s negative forms of *gunas*

anālaṃkāra as opposites of *ojas* and *udāratva* respectively [1] not hinted at by Daṇḍin.

THE *UPAMĀDOṢAS* OR THE DEFECTS OF SIMILE

Besides the positive and negative *doṣas* discussed above Daṇḍin refers to the flaws of simile which he regards as defects only if they perturb the mind of a reader [2] In case, however, they do not wound the cultivated sensibility, they cease to be *doṣas* The defects that may occur in the employment of simile are as follows (1) Disparity in gender of the object and standard of comparison;[3] e g हंसीव धवलश्चन्द्रः (II 55) (*the moon* is white like *a female goose*) (2) Disparity in number; e g सरांसीवामलं नभः (II. 55) (the *sky* is clear like the *lakes*) (3) Inferior similitude e.g. भक्तिमान् भटः श्वेव (II 55) (like *a dog* the soldier is loyal to his master) (4) Superior similitude e g खद्योतो भाति भानुवत् (II. 55) (the glow-worm shines like *the sun*)

According to Bhāmaha, Medhāvin dealt with seven defects of simile which besides the aforesaid four, included (1) *asambhava* (impossibility), (2) *viparyaya* (contrariety) and (3) *upamānāsadṛśatā* (non-similitude) [4] Probably both Daṇḍin and Medhāvin adopted the defects from the earlier tradition, some *doṣas* might have been originally inspired from the varieties of simile in Bharata. The defects of superior and inferior similitude and those of impossibility and non-similitude for instance, appear to have developed as extreme forms of the varieties *praśaṃsā nindā, kalpitā* and *kiṃcitsadṛśī* respectively in Bharata [5] After Bhāmaha, Vāmana reduces the number to six by conceiving in *viparyaya* the scope of superior and inferior similitude [6] while Rudraṭa mentions only four *vaiṣamya, asambhava apra-*

1 Cp SKA I. 23-41 ŚPr IX (Josyer ed. II pp 337-8)

2 Cp KA II. 51-6

3 Sanskrit poets have generally tried to achieve the formal correspondence in gender [cp Ragh. VI. 69 where *ṣaṭpadāḥ* (swarm of bees and not *ṣaṭpadī*) has been given as the standard of comparison for a maiden also cp Megh. II. 6] though there are occasional lapses, as in Rām. Kiṣk. I. 10 22 43 as pointed out by V. Raghavan SCAS pp 73-4

4 BKAL II. 39-40

5 BNS XVII. 50-5

6 Cp KASV IV 2 8-11 and *vṛtti*

siddhi and *sāmānyaśabdabheda*, the last including all cases of change of the word indicating common property due to difference of gender, number, time, case notion (*kāraka*) and case (*vibhakti*)[1] Bhoja admits only the four defects of Daṇḍin He, however, adjusts them in his general treatment of the defects and not in the context of the figure itself[2] While discussing his *doṣa-guṇas* (defects becoming excellences in changed conditions), he also refers to the cases of defective simile where the cultivated sensibility is not hurt evidently on the suggestion of Daṇḍin to that effect[3] Later writers also recognise these defects of similitude[4]

---

1 Cp RKAI XI 24

2 SKA I 25–6 also cp ŚPr IX Josyer ed. II p 337

3 SKA I 147–50 also I 120 ŚPr IX Josyer ed. II p 353 cp KA II 51

4 Cp KPr X k 142 ff AS k 15 *vṛtti* SD VII 15 f RG (KM ed) p 823 these writers however do not admit their separate entity

CHAPTER VI

THE *ALAMKĀRA* DOCTRINE OF DAṆḌIN

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE

The *alamkāra* doctrine in Sanskrit Poetics is perhaps as old as the theory on poetry itself It is generally admitted that the study of poetry in Sanskrit began with some general principle of embellishment (*alamkāra*)[1] which referred to the expression in its various forms its structural beauty, the flaws which harmed its charm and the excellences which added thereto The aesthetic judgement was based on the means of external decoration, and the aesthetic delight was conceived objectively from the standpoint of external adornment which contributed to it[2] The question as to what constitutes poetry or the real poetic charm did not draw the attention of the earlier theorists like Daṇḍin and Bhamaha who confined their schemes mainly to what they called the body of poetry as distinct from its soul[3] The word and the sense it conveyed were considered to be the two chief elements which formed the body of poetry[4] and the

---

1 Etymologically the word *alamkāra* (*alam*+$\sqrt{}$*kṛ*) signifies that which gives sufficiency or power to a common and unadorned thing, and connotes extrinsic decoration or ornament

2 Cp De HSP II pp 33 ff

3 Cp KA I 10 BKAl I 23 it was Vāmana (I 2 6) who for the first time dealt with the question He made *rīti* the soul of poetry It was only vaguely realised with reference to *mārga* by Daṇḍin who regarded the *guṇas* as its life breath (I 42) and with reference to the figurative expression by Bhāmaha who proposed to take *vakrokti* as its underlying principle (II 85)

4 Cp KA I 10 also cp Bhāmaha (BKAl I 15) it is significant that all theorists from Daṇḍin to Jagannātha irrespective of the school to which they belong agree on taking the word and sense as constituting the body of poetry cp (besides Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha) Vāmana (I 1 1 *vṛtti*) Rudraṭa (II 1) Mammaṭa (KPr I 4) Viśvanātha (SD X 1) Jagannātha (RG p 4) etc. In fact the two elements form the central bond which links all the theories together

alaṁkāras (poetic figures) were regarded as means of beautifying it

There might have been long before Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha a tradition which gave prominence to poetic embellishments along with poetic excellences and considered the *alaṁkāras* to be the principal elements of poetry The tradition perhaps synchronised with the earlier form of *rasa* doctrine, and the two received inspiration and influence from each other In Daṇḍin, we notice a well-developed form of the *alaṁkāra* tradition which fact indicates that its beginning dated much earlier than him Unfortunately we do not know of the numerous *ācāryas* who according to Rajaśekhara, wrote on individual figures like *anuprāsa*, *yamaka* *citra* *śabdaśleṣa* *vāstava* *upamā*, *atiśaya* *arthaśleṣa* and *ubhayālaṁkāra*[1] In Daṇḍin, we visualise for the first time the self conscious existence of the *alaṁkāra* doctrine, though we do not yet get in him a thoroughly critical system which we notice in later theorists Some scholars, associating Daṇḍin solely with the *rīti* theory, deny him a place in the *alaṁkāra* school or at least hesitate to regard him as a full fledged *alaṁkāra* theorist One of the reasons for this hesitation appears to be that Bhāmaha who is undoubtedly a prominent *ācārya* of the *alaṁkāra* school refutes bitterly the views of Daṇḍin, or as some hold Daṇḍin makes vigorous attacks on Bhāmaha But in fact their opposition never refers to the basic principle of *alaṁkāra* or its importance or otherwise, but it simply appertains to the question of admissibility of certain poetic figures as such or to problems not connected with the *alaṁkāra* doctrine such as supremacy of *pratibhā* as a source of poetry narrator in a *mahākāvya* differentiation between *kathā* and *ākhyāyikā* classification of *mārga* and *guṇa* and acceptance of the eleventh *doṣa* as such According to S K De, since Daṇḍin holds that it is not the poetic figures only, but several literary excellences that constitute the essence of the poetic manners or diction in the realisation of which alone the essence of poetry lies and puts marked emphasis on the *mārga*

1 See above, ch I Daṇḍin deals with all these poetic figures except *vāstava* which we find in Rudraṭa (VII 9-10)

and its constituent excellences to which the *alamkāra* school is apparently indifferent, he should be placed in the fundamental theoretic attitude, in the *rīti* school[1] The view, however, is only partially acceptable True that Daṇḍin attaches considerable importance to the *margas* and the excellences constituting them and as such he is certainly a precursor of Vāmana, but it is also true that he gives an equally prominent place to the *alamkaras* in poetry According to him, a good *kavya* should be embellished by the decorative devices which are technically called *alamkāras*[2] A critical examination of his doctrine shows that his conception of *alamkara* is far wider than that of the *gunas* which are included, in his comprehensive scheme of the *alamkāras* as the special figures characterising particular poetic dictions Not only the *gunas* but also the various forms of dramatic joints (*samdhis*) and manners (*vṛttis*) and the *laksanas* have been conceived by him within the jurisdiction of the concept of *alamkara* It is also important to note that the exhaustive treatment which Daṇḍin gives to this concept has not been accorded by him to any other topic[3] The special emphasis which he puts on the *alamkāras* in poetry is amply indicated by his dictum तैं शरीर च काव्यानाम अलकाराश्च दर्शिता[4] Here he refers to the *alamkāras* along with the body of poetry, evidently as the principal elements thereof He should be regarded therefore as an *alamkāra* theorist with the same force with which he is associated with the *rīti* school In fact, he affiliates himself to both the schools and it should be clearly understood that he cannot be linked exclusively with either of the two[5] And S K De himself admits the fact that Daṇḍin allies himself with the standpoint of the *alamkara* school inasmuch as he pays considerable attention to the elaboration of poetic figures[6] But as we have

1 Cp HSP II p 78
2 KA I 18–9 also cp II 1
3 His treatment of *alamkāras* (in 499 verses) is much more elaborate and *exhaustive than that of Bhāmaha (BKAI II 4–95 III 1–56* numbering about 150 verses only)
4 KA I 10
5 Cp also Kane HSP pp 89–90
6 HSP, II p 78

seen, this much is not sufficient to say of him

After Daṇḍin, Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and Rudrata occupy prominent place in the development of the doctrine Even though an advocate of the *alamkāra* theory, Bhāmaha was a bitter opponent of Daṇḍin The opposition was probably due to the fact that while Dandin admitted the element of *svabhāvokti*, along with that of *vakrokti* in his conception of *alamkāra*, Bhāmaha vehemently discarded the first and accepted only the second which according to him determined the soul of an *alamkara*[1] Another point of difference between the two theorists is formed by Daṇḍin s predilection for the *mārga guna* theory to which Bhāmaha shows utter indifference Despite the difference in certain matters both the writers follow the same fundamental principle Later theorists like Udbhata and Rudraṭa generally follow Bhāmaha in point of policy and detail[2] Daṇḍin seems to have influenced Udbhaṭa with regard to the oneness of *guna* and *alamkara* which view he is said to have held[3] Rudraṭa is the last great expositor of the *alamkara* school strictly so called Although he deals with the *riti* and *rasa* doctrines as well, he is essentially an *alamkāra* theorist His treatment of *alamkāras* is elaborate He adds about thirty figures to the list of thirty eight in Udbhaṭa He classifies figures into those of word and sense and divides the latter into the categories of *vastava*, *aupamya atiśaya* and *sleṣa* His exposition of *vakrokti* is different from that of the earlier theorists, it was finally accepted by almost all later writers, despite the different conception attributed to it in Vamana and Kuntaka After Rudraṭa, the school began to decline and finally losing its independent status, merged along with the *riti* school, into the predominant *rasa-dhvani* school, though there did come some writers who advocated the theory of *alamkara* with the zeal and force of the earlier theorists[4] It is not perhaps correct to hold that the

---

1 BKAI II 85 also I 36 V 66 also cp De HSP II pp 47-51

2 Cp De HSP II pp 54 6

3 Cp Ruyyaka AS p 9

4 Cp the author of Agni-P (344 2) Ruyyaka (AS p 10) Bhoja (SKA I 2) Hemacandra (KAn 1) Vidyānātha Vāgbhaṭa I (I 2) Jayadeva (I 7) and others

attaches more importance to the *gunas* as essentials of a good diction in poetry and assigns an inferior place to the *alamkaras* as constituents of diction, both good and bad [1] Danḍin in fact nowhere expresses or implies such a relative prominence of the *gunas* His definition of *alamkara* as the characteristic element which produces charm in poetry establishes beyond doubt its superiority over the *gunas* Equally untenable for the same reason is the view held by P C Lahiri and S K De that Danḍin makes the presence of *gunas*, and not of poetic figures the absolute condition of a good composition [2] As a matter of fact, the *alamkāras* with their wider range conceiving the *gunas* within their fold enjoyed a better position in his scheme

Nor is the view defensible that Danḍin makes no distinction between the *gunas* and the *alamkāras*,[3] because excepting his inclusion of the former into the latter in the second chapter he has never confused the two concepts [4] Again, as P C Lahiri remarks, 'while every *guna* is an *alamkāra* to Danḍin not every *alamkāra* is a *guna* ,[5] which fact indicates that the author did distinguish the two concepts In fact, the tradition which differentiated the two was quite old even Bharata treated them separately Danḍin however due to his peculiar standpoint, accommodates the two into one definition within a certain limit for, according to him, both of them are the elements which beautify a poetic composition S K De remarks that Danḍin practically foreshadows the rigid differentiation of *guna* and *alamkāra* of *riti* school,[6] perhaps implying thereby that in pre

---

(SKA V ŚPr XI Josyer ed II p 435) who quotes KA II 3 with the remark that the *gunas* like *śleṣa* etc have been conceived as *alaṁkāras* by Danḍin The fact is further evidenced by KA III 137 and 141 where Danḍin employs the term *alaṁkāra* for *doṣa* becoming *guna* in a changed condition implying thereby the identity of *alamkāra* and *guna*

1 De (HSP II pp 82-4 cp also SPSA pp 26-7) holds the view

2 Cp CRG pp 57-8 also De SPSA p 26

3 Cp Kane (HSP pp 374 379) who holds the view

4 Cp the use of the term *guna* to signify poetic excellences in KA I 42 76 81 100 and of the term *alamkāra* to denote poetic figures in II 7 116 214 220 237 etc also cp De HSP II pp 82-4

5 CRG pp 57-8

6 HSP, II p 84

Daṇḍin tradition they formed basically one concept and that Daṇḍin for the first time hinted indirectly at the difference between the two But as noted above, the difference was traditional, and Daṇḍin, and following him, Udbhaṭa and others,[1] tried to efface the distinction of course, within certain limits As a reaction to this Vāmana establishes their difference in definite terms As a propounder of the *rīti* theory, he was obliged to give more prominence to *guṇas* than to *alamkāras*, and for this reason he had to make a clear distinction between the two concepts and thus, according to him, while *guṇas* constitute the elements which produce charm in a poetic composition the *alamkāras* merely add to the charm[2] In other words, the *guṇas* form the permanent properties of word and sense whereas the *alamkaras* are just transitory elements thereof[3] It purports that the poetic charm cannot exist in the absence of the *guṇas*, but if they are present, the poetic charm exists even in the absence of the *alamkāras* The divergence in the respective standpoints of Daṇḍin and Vamana indicates the fact that the former did not have that fervour which the latter cherished for the *rīti* theory On the other hand, Daṇḍin had a definite predilection for the theory of *alamkara* The *dhvani* theorists and their followers accepted the viewpoint of Vamana, but they did it only partially They did regard *guṇas* as the permanent properties of *kāvya* and *alamkāras* as transitory ones[4] But they did not accept word and sense as the *āśraya* (container) of the *guṇas* They rather considered *guṇas* to be the properties of *rasa* and conceived them as internal elements[5]

---

1 Cp Ruyyaka AS p 9 Bhoja SKA V and ŚPr XI Josyer ed II pp 435 ff

2 Cp KASV III 1 1-2 Taruṇa on KA II 1 refutes Vāmana s view and observes that the point of distinction is not real b cause by beautifying a *kāvya* just adding to its beauty is meant

3 Cp KASV III 1 3 also Udbhaṭa in *Bhāmaha vṛtti* cp KPr VIII k 67 *vṛtti* also cp SPSA pp 26 30-1 for the relationship betwe n the two cp also B S Vyasa BSK I pp 41-6

4 KPr VIII k 66-7 1 k 3 f SD X 1 *vṛtti*

5 Cp for detail Nagendra HKAS intro pp 77-80

PRINCIPAL ELEMENTS OF POETIC FIGURES

When we admit that *alamkāras* produce the poetic charm, the question naturally arises as to what constitutes the poetic charm or what characteristic attributes the poetic figures possess causing them to be the means of embellishing a *kavya*. The question draws Dandin's attention, though he does not elaborate the matter. According to him, *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* are the two characteristic elements which add beauty to all kinds of expression (*vānmaya*) [1] The *svabhāvokti* consists in the depiction of the natural disposition of an object. Although the poetic expression of the natural disposition may not formally depart from the descriptions or narrations in our common life there is a basic and subtle difference between the two, for, as S K De observes the poet sees or conceives the very same thing not in the same way as common people do. In the case of the latter all things stand in some relation to their personal interests which should be understood to connote also scientific interest in them as objects of knowledge. But for the poet, the object has no connexion with his or anybody's interests not even as an object of knowledge he has a vision of the thing in itself in its true nature [2] According to Ratnaśrijñana *svabhāvokti* possesses charm only when it contains something special or striking in its expression and it is this strikingness of expression which brightens up the natural form of an object and in the absence of which a mere factual statement cannot be taken as a poetic figure [3] This seems to be exactly the standpoint of Daṇḍin when he defines *svabhavokti* as the expression which brings an object manifestly to our mind's eye [4] With this point of view, Daṇḍin regards the expression of the natural disposition also as a characteristic element of the poetic figures

---

1 Cp KA II 363 भिन्नं द्विधा स्वभावोक्तिर्वक्रोक्तिश्चेति वाङ्मयम् ।
2 HSP II p 49 fn intro to VJ p xx fn 19 also cp SPSA p 73
3 On KA II 8
4 KA II 8 नानावस्थं पदार्थानां रूपं साक्षाद् विवृण्वती ।, cp Taruṇa thereon Also cp Mahimabhaṭṭa [VV (TSS ed) p 108] Hemacandra (explaining his viewpoint) and Māṇikyacandra (on KPr X k 111) for detail cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 113-5 also cp Krishna Chaitanya SP pp 78-80

It is generally understood that by the term *svabhāvokti*, referred to along with *vakrokti* Daṇḍin means merely the particular figure of that name which he exalts as the primary figure barring which all other poetic figures in his view come into the sphere of *vakrokti*[1] But in fact, the element of *svabhāvokti* must be distinguished from the figure bearing that name even if they are, to certain extent identical because the term *svabhāvokti* when it is employed in juxtaposition to as wide a concept as *vakrokti*, must necessarily connote a similarly pervasive sense There can be no doubt that the term *vakrokti* in Daṇḍin represents a concept wider than that of an individual poetic figure, and it has certainly been employed as an essential principle characterising the poetic figures It does not appear in him as an individual figure as *svabhāvokti* does Vāmana and Rudraṭa were the first to regard it as a specific poetic figure, to which precise and narrow signification it was reduced from a very broad sense[2] It is incorrect to think that while the term *vakrokti* denotes an element the *svabhāvokti* is merely a figure, for it does not appear to be sound that all the figures excepting *svabhāvokti* were to Daṇḍin the different forms of *vakrokti*[3] There are certainly some other figures as well where the element of *svabhāvokti*, rather than that of *vakrokti*, is conspicuous by its presence In this connection mention may be made of the figures *hetu sukṣma, leśa, āśis yathāsamkhya, preyas* and *bhāvika* which contain in them the element of *svabhāvokti* Bhāmaha refers to these figures except the last three as unpossessed of the charm of *vakrokti*[4] In Rudraṭa s figures based on *vāstava*, the expression of the natural disposition of a thing which lacks the elements of simile, exaggeration and paronomasia[5] the element of *svabhāvokti* is prominent He has given in this group the figures *sahokti, jāti* (*svabhāvokti*) *yathā*

1 KA II 8-13 and 363

2. Cp De HSP, I p 84 cp also Ruyyaka AS k 77 & *vṛtti*

3 Hṛd on KA II 363 expresses the view and De (HSP II p 85) follows it

4 Cp BKAl II 86-7 92, III 55 the last three figures also can be held to be possessed of *svabhāvokti* element.

5 Cp RKAl VII 10

samkhya, dipaka, parivṛtti, hetu, vyatireka sukṣma and *leśa*, from among those treated by Dandin

Dandin does not define the term *vakrokti* (devious speech), which he regards as a characteristic element of the figures[1] Bhāmaha too, who mentions it many times,[2] does not define it It appears that the concept was already too well known in their time to require elucidation The meaning *devious* or *ironical speech* appears in the verbal poetic figure, *vakrokti* defined by Rudrata and later theorists as a kind of pretended speech[3] In Vāmana however, it appears as an ideal figure in the form of metaphorical expression based on transference of sense(*lakṣana*)[4] We may understand Dandin s *vakrokti* as the opposite of *svabhavokti* It is a certain peculiarity or charm of expression which implies a selection of words and turning up of ideas peculiar to poetry and abhorrent of matter of fact speech Bhāmaha derives from Dandin this conception of *vakrokti* though his standpoint is different inasmuch as he regards it as the sole essential principle of the figures and discards the *svabhāvokti*[5] He rejects the figures *hetu suksma* and *lesa* for their being devoid of the element of *vakrokti* which in his opinion manifests the poetic sense and without which no embellishment of poetry is possible[6] With regard to the respective viewpoints of Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha in this respect Nagendra observes that according to Bhāmaha natural depiction too is a kind of *vakrokti* while Daṇḍin differentiates natural speech from the devious one and regards the former as less important, it being just desirable and not essential in poetry[7] The view how ver is not admissible since

1 KA II 363
2 Cp BKAI II 85–6 also cp I 36 V 66
3 RKAI II 13–7 KPr IX k 78 AS k 77 *vṛtti* SD X 9
4 Cp KASV IV 3 8
5 BKAI I 30 36 II 85 he deals (in II 93–4) with *svabhāvokti* only in deference to tradition
6 Cp BKAI II 85–6
7 Cp BKB p 187 Nagendra bases his view on KA II 13 काव्येष्वप्येत दीप्सितम it is desirable in the *kavyas* also but read with the preceding line शास्त्रेष्वस्यैव साम्राज्यम it signifies the essentiality and not merely desirability of the figure in poetry The force of *api* also supports and strengthens the view

Daṇḍin's predilection for *svabhāvokti*, which he calls the primary figure, is more than evident. S K. De thinks that although Daṇḍin uses the term *vakrokti* as a collective name of individual figures he does not apply it to the essential poetic quality underlying them, for which he employs the term *alamkāra* itself [1] But while the term does not indeed appear in him as a collective designation of all the figures (excluding as it does the figures of the *svabhāvokti* class), it does signify in him the essential element of the figurative speech characterised by strikingness (*vakratva*) of expression Kuntaka develops, after Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha, the idea of *vakrokti* which he exalts to the position of the soul of poetry, and builds a peculiar theory of *alamkāra* on its basis [2] His *vakrokti* signifies the peculiar charm or strikingness which can be imparted to ordinary expression by poetic imagination [3] He uses the term as almost co-extensive with the concept of *alamkāra* and regards the poetic figures as various forms of *vakrokti* [4]

Besides these dominating elements Daṇḍin alludes to some other attributes also which in their position even as specific figures add to the charm of other poetic figures and thus constitute in a way the characteristic elements of some of them One of such elements is the idea of *atiśayokti* which according to him is the expression of something special transcending the limit of ordinary speech He calls it a figure of highest class and regards it as an attribute which brightens up the charm of other poetic figures [5] Rudrata subscribes to the view by forming a separate group of figures based on *atiśaya* which includes *utprekṣā vibhāvanā virodha viśeṣa* and *hetu* from among those dealt with by Daṇḍin Bhāmaha and perhaps following him, Vāmana also expressly admit the element of *atiśaya* in the figure

---

1 SPSA p 24 VJ intro, pp xxi–xxiv
2 VJ I 42, also cp De intro to VJ pp xxv–xxxii
3 VJ I 10 (वक्रोक्तिरेव वैदग्ध्यभङ्गीभणितिरुच्यते), also cp De intro to VJ pp. xxvii–xxviii
4 VJ I 2, 7 10 For detail cp De HSP II pp 184–94 VJ intro xv ff xxx–xxxi SPSA pp 34–7 V Raghavan ŚPr pp 114–31 Nagendra op cit pp. 197–395
5 KA II 220 cp Hrd. and Ratna. also

utprekṣā[1] It is to be noted that the *viśeṣadarśana* (striking ness of expression) of Daṇḍin in *viśeṣokti* and *virodha* is the same as the *viśeṣavivakṣā* of his *atiśayokti*[2] Ānandavardhana also accepts *atiśayokti* in this form, which according to him can be included in all poetic figures, as it has been successfully done by great poets for the purpose of producing charm in poetry He also remarks that a poetic figure endowed with the charm of *atiśayokti*, the essence of all poetic figures, becomes brilliant[3] Abhinavagupta takes *atiśayokti* to be the generic property of all poetic figures while Mammaṭa regards it as their life breath[4]

Daṇḍin s conception of *atiśayokti* appears to be slightly different from that of *vakrokti* it is characterised prominently by the element of exaggeration while in the *vakrokti* the trait of deviousness enjoys the upper hand According to Ratna śrījñāna Daṇḍin s *svabhāvokti* which is devoid of *vakrokti* element is possessed of the trait of *atiśaya* The two concepts, however, are identical in connotation to a great extent both of them consist in the transgression of the limit of worldly usage and in treading an uncommon path of expression[5] It is perhaps for this reason that Bhāmaha calls *atiśayokti* a *vakrokti* which gives peculiarity to the sense[6] According to Kuntaka also some kind of *atiśaya* is involved in *vakrokti* The *atiśaya* in him is an essential element of the *vicitra marga* where striking ness of devious speech prevails[7]

Śleṣa also has been referred to by Daṇḍin as an element which, when employed with discrimination enhances the grace of almost all figures of the *vakrokti* class[8] The author specifi cally mentions some figures where *śleṣa* adds to their beauty

1 Cp BKAI II 91 KASV IV 3 9
2 Cp KA II 323 333 and 214 respectively for the figures
3 DhA III 36 and *vṛtti* (pp 498 ff)
4 Abhinavagupta s Loc on DhA III 36 and *vṛtti* (pp 498 ff) KPr X k 136 f also cp SD X 54-5 (*sahokti* figure which he admits only with the element of *atiśaya*)
5 Cp KA II 214 BKAI II 81 RKAI IX 1-2
6 BKAI II 85
7 VJ I 42 cp De HSP II p 51 intro to VJ p xxix
8 Cp KA II 363 श्लेष सर्वासु पुष्णाति प्रायो वक्रोक्तिषु श्रियम् ।

Such figures are *upama rupaka ākṣepa* and *vyatireka* as also *dīpaka arthāntaranyāsa vyajastuti* and *virodha*[1] There are still some other figures in Dandin such as *tulyayogita* and *samāsokti* which involve *double entendre* Bhatti and Bhāmaha recognise the accompaniment of *slesa* with *upamā sahokti* and *hetu*[2] According to Udbhata, in cases of combination *slesa* is stronger than the other figures with which it is joined to the extent even of dispelling their apprehension[3] There are, however writers who do not admit its supremacy or who even propose its inferiority[4] Daṇḍin does not say anything in this regard though he appears to imply *slesa* s relative prominence Rudraṭa regards it as an element underlying the *vakrokti* figure, and also forms a separate group of figures based on it[5] In fact, *sleṣa*, on account of its comprehensive scope, occupies in Sanskrit Poetics an important place both as an individual figure and as an element beautifying other figures

Although the idea of similitude *(aupamya)* has not been expressly mentioned as an element[6] the writer s treatment of the figure *upamā* shows that he conceives it as an element which either assists or, at least accompanies other figures Ten among its thirty two varieties are such as appear in the form of independent figures in the works of later theorists[7] *Rupaka* an important figure has been expressly described by Daṇḍin as a form of *upama* where the difference is not expressed, but

---

1 Cp KA II 313 for the figures cp II 28 29 87 114 160 170 174 186 339 345–6

2 Cp BKAl III 17

3 Ruyyaka (AS k 33 *vrtti*) also is inclined to hold this view though in certain cases he admits *śleṣa* s relative inferiority cp De HSP II p 56 S S Janaki AS intro pp 118–24

4 Cp Mammata KPr IX k 84 *vrtti* Jagannatha RG p 393 also cp Kane notes on SD p 201

5 Cp RKAl VII 9 X 1 f also cp II 14

6 As De (HSP II p 73) points out Vāmana is the first to take *aupamya* as the central principle Ruyyaka (AS k 11 *vrtti* p 36) remarks that *upamā* on account of its manifold strikingness constitutes the primary element of the poetic figures.

7 See below for detail also cp De HSP, II p 85

implied [1] Other figures which can be said to contain the *aupamya* element are *vyatireka samāsokti utprekṣā, apahnuti, tulyayogitā, aprastutapraśaṁsā* and *nidarśana* [2]

The position of *bhāvika* is not very much clear, though its exposition indicates that like *svabhāvokti*, it involves the implication of an aesthetic factor in the form of an excellence pervading the whole poetic composition (*prabandhaviṣaya*),[3] and as such, it may be regarded as an element which assists the figures in the realisation of poetic charm

Bhoja, a staunch follower of Daṇḍin adds *rasokti* to the *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* of the latter, as an element which characterises all poetic compositions [4] In Daṇḍin, however, the concept occupies a subordinate or rather insignificant place, as we shall see later

CONCEPTION OF INDIVIDUAL FIGURES

There is divergence of opinion among Sanskrit theorists with regard to the exact nature and scope of the individual figures We observe more often than not, numerous conceptions of the same figure in different writers While dealing with individual figures we shall have an occasion to refer to the various conceptions they developed in course of time A typical example of how some of them underwent dynamic conceptual changes at the hands of different theorists is the figure *akṣepa* which developed as many as six different conceptions in the course of the process of its development [5] In many cases, the conceptual difference is very slight and, therefore, negligible, though there are instances where the divergence is great and hence conspicuous The difference sometimes has been caused by the divergence in respective viewpoints of the theorists, but the main cause of conceptual development is the gradual growth

---

1 Cp II 66 see below also

2 Rudraṭa (*RKAl VIII 59 74 89, 99*) enumerates besides these *saṁśaya anyokti ākṣepa* and *sahokti* (from among the figures present in Daṇḍin) in this group

3 KA II 364 and Ratna thereon cp De SPSP pp 54-8 also see below

4 Cp SKA V 8 ŚPr XI Josyer ed II p 438

5 See below also cp De HSP, II, pp 70–1

of figures and the consequent refining process which was carried to its extreme by Sanskrit rhetoricians, and an examination of their conceptual development in the writers of different schools or of the same school affords an interesting study [1] We propose to discuss the notable stages of conceptual development of the poetic figures dealt with in Dandin s work, in the following chapter

QUANTITATIVE GROWTH OF POETIC FIGURES

Another special feature of the treatment of figures in Sanskrit Poetics is the ingenious process of their fine differentiation by way of dividing and sub dividing them The process has resulted into multiplication of individual figures on one hand and the growth of a large number of varieties and sub-varieties on the other Figures have been classified into numerous species on the basis of different cases of their occurrence [2] the cases sometimes being very vague and uncertain The minute analysis which plays a more eventful part in the later theorists actually starts with Daṇḍin though its seed was sown by still earlier writers [3] Although Dandin wisely remarks that, if for some slight difference a separate figure is formed, there can be no end to this limitless multiplication and that the varieties of different figures are beyond the scope of enumeration and discussion,[4] and even claims to have analysed and rearranged the figures along with their varieties enumerated by former theorists,[5] yet he himself falls a prey to this deplorable tendency He is the first writer to give the largest varieties of simile numbering thirty two He classifies *rupaka* into twenty

---

1 Cp also De HSP II pp 70-1

2. Thus *upamā* is divided into about 32 forms (about 42 forms in Agni-P 344 6 ff) *utprekṣā* into 32, *vyatireka* into 48 and *virodha* into 10 by the pedantic theorists The remark of Ānandavardhana (DhA I 1 v *iii* p 27) that thousands of forms of figures have been invented and the process is on is interesting in this respect

3 Cp Daṇḍin s remark (II 2) किन्तु बीजं विकल्पानां पूर्वाचार्यैः प्रदर्शितम् ।

4 KA II 96 368 also cp. II 1 ते चाद्यापि विकल्प्यन्ते कस्तान् कार्त्स्न्येन वक्ष्यति, also see De HSP II p 63

5 KA II 2 तदेव परिसंस्कर्तुमयमस्मत्परिश्रमः ।

forms, *ākṣepa* into twenty four, *hetu* into sixteen and *yamaka* into more than fifty varieties [1] As the study of Poetics advances, the number of independent figures together with their varieties goes on increasing till it exceeds two hundred The later theorists like Ruyyaka, Jayadeva and Appaya Dikṣita devote their whole works to the exclusive treatment of the figures

In the steady growth of the number of figures and their species, the role played by the concept of *lakṣaṇas* has been two fold On one hand a good number of *lakṣaṇas* directly developed into independent figures and, on the other, some of them gave birth to a large number of varieties in interaction with figures as Abhinavagupta observes [2]

CLASSIFICATION OF POETIC FIGURES

Since, according to Daṇḍin the poetic figures embellish the body of poetry composed of word and sense they decorate, by implication the word and the idea conveyed thereby [3] On this basis, Daṇḍin for the first time classifies specifically the figures into *arthālaṃkāra* and *śabdālaṃkāra* [4] according as they appertain to the idea and the word respectively and treats them in separate chapters (II and III) Some later writers add a third class of figures called *ubhayālaṃkāras* which refer both to word and sense

The ideal figures, by virtue of their superiority over the verbal figures have always engaged greater attention of the theorists and the favourite refining process has been more systematically pursued in this sphere Daṇḍin also naturally devotes greater attention and volume to this class of figures He mentions in all thirty five figures most of them consisting of

1 Also cp his figures *dīpaka* having 12 forms *arthāntaranyāsa* 8 *vyatireka* 10 and *prahelikā* with 16 varieties

2. AB pp 390-1 401 cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 15-25 see below also

3 Cp KA I 10 II 1 also see above

4 KA III 186 also cp I 50 (but the interpretation of it is doubtful) De (HSP II p 72) is *hardly right when he says that the above classification* obtained from Rudraṭa s time In fact Bhāmaha (cp BKAI I 14-5) Udbhaṭa (who treats his verbal figures first followed by the ideal figures) and Vāmana (cp his *vṛtti* preceding IV 1 1 and IV 2. 1) also know the distinction

numerous varieties. The multiplication of species is as noted above a special feature of his treatment of the figures in contrast to that of Bhāmaha and Vāmana, though in theory he is wisely opposed to the endless differentiation which he regards both as impracticable and futile.[1]

As to the further classification of ideal figures according to their essential characteristics, he seems to divide them into two broad categories of *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti*, though we cannot precisely say which of the figures he means to include in the respective classes. However as noted above he probably means to accommodate *hetu*, *sūkṣma*, *leśa*, *yathāsaṁkhya*, *preyas*, *ā .. bhāvika* and *svabhāvokti* in his *svabhāvokti* class and the rest of the figures in his *vakrokti* group.

Rudraṭa groups the figures systematically under *vāstava* (factuality), *aupamya* (similitude), *atiśaya* (exaggeration) and *śleṣa* (*double entendre*).[2] Ruyyaka suggests the classification based on similitude, incongruity, chain, logical inference, apprehension of hidden meaning and lastly commixtion of different figures.[3] Later writers substantially follow this classification.

---

1. KA II. 1-2, 95, 3^2; also cp above.
2. RKA VII. 9.
3. Cp K. L. Poddar, SSI, II pp 103-6; also cp B. S. Vyasa, BSK, I pp 65-76.

CHAPTER VII

POETIC FIGURES OF DANDIN

We propose to discuss in this chapter the poetic figures along with their main varieties dealt with in the *Kavyādarśa*, with a general reference to their origin and conceptual develop ment at the different stages of Sanskrit Poetics First of all, we shall take up the figures which refer to the sense treated at great length in the second chapter of the work, followed by the verbal figures dealt with in the third chapter

IDEAL FIGURES (*ARTHĀLAMKĀRAS*)

1 *Svabhavokti* (natural description), also called *jati*, is the description which brings to our mind's eye the actual form of the object depicted (which may be either genus, quality, action or individual) in its different conditions (II 8) It is the primary (*ādyā*) figure which occupies supreme place both in poetry and the poetics as the writer remarks [1]

It appears from this statement of his that the figure was traditional It is, however, unknown to Bharata though his *lakṣana diṣṭa* is comparable to it In the gradual growth of the figures, it comes after the second stage of development, as noted above though Daṇḍin specifically gives it the first place in his *alamkāra* scheme to stamp its unique position The figure might have developed from another figure, *vārttā* which is said to form a part of it The term *varttā* in Daṇḍin, how ever is not at all related to the conception of this figure [3] The

---

1 KA II 13 शास्त्रेष्वस्यैव साम्राज्यं काव्येष्वप्येतदीप्सितम् ।

2 BNS XVII 3 cp V Raghavan SCAS p 42

3 De (HSP II pp 28 86) erroneously thinks that Daṇḍin in KA I 85 alludes to the figure *vārttā* which term evidently means there *a dialogue* cp above pt I ch III cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 96 ff The figure *vārttā* however was known to Bhaṭṭi (X 45) and the author of Viṣṇu (XIV 11)

alternate term *jāti* for the figure shows that it originally consisted in a description of *jāti* (genus or a class of things), recognised as one of its four varieties in Daṇḍin, which formed perhaps the earliest conception of the figure [1] We find the first mention of the term *jāti* in the works of Bāṇa, and according to *Jayamangalā*, Bhaṭṭi also knew it [2] Bhāmaha, though indifferent towards the figure on account of his peculiar viewpoint, defines it evidently in deference to its traditional prominence [3] Almost all the theorists accept the figure, though it has been differently conceived by some of them [4] Vāmana comprehends it in the scope of his ideal *guṇa arthavyakti*, in contrast to which Mammaṭa includes the *guṇa* itself in the *svabhavokti* figure [5] Although Kuntaka of the *vakrokti* fame vehemently rejects the figure he agrees to admit it provided there is some kind of strikingness (*vastuvakratā*)[6] in the matter in hand and, as we have seen, some such strikingness is implied in Daṇḍin s words, रूप साक्षाद् विवृण्वती ।[7] Mahimabhaṭṭa defends the figure on the ground of this very element which does characterise the figure [8]

2 *Upamā* (simile) is comparison based on similarity between two objects (II 14) Daṇḍin in this definition does not refer to the four requisites of simile *viz* the object and the standard of comparison, the common property and the words expressive of similitude, but he certainly knew them and recognised their importance [9]

---

1 Cp V Raghavan *op cit* pp 93-4

2 Cp Hcar intro v 8 Kād intro v 9 Bhaṭṭi x 45 and the comm thereon

3 BKAl II 93-4

4 Cp SKA III 4 ŚPr X (Josyer ed. II p 391) Hemacandra s KAn (KM ed) p 329 KPr X k 111, AS k 78 *vṛtti* SD X 92. Udbhaṭa (KASS III 8) differently interprets it

5 Cp KASV III 2 13 and KPr VIII k 72 f

6 Cp VJ III 1 f for his rejection of the figure cp I 11-2

7 KA II 8 cp Taruṇa thereon Rudraṭa Vāmana and Bhoja also emphasise this point cp Krishna Chaitanya SP pp 78 ff

8 Cp VV (TSS ed) p 104 For a detailed study of the concept see V Raghavan SCAS pp 93-116 ŚPr pp 132-7

9 Elsewhere he does refer to *upameya* (II 228) *upamāna* (II 228 230), *dharma* or *tulyadharma* or *samaguna* (II. 15, 16 228 231) and *vyañjaka*

The figure is very old and represents perhaps the oldest phase of the growth of the figures in Sanskrit Poetics [1] Dandin s definition of it when compared with the later expositions, seems to be primitive, and is comparable in scope only to that of Bharata [2] In later theorists we come across a well defined form of its conception, though, of course, the basic idea remained the same throughout [3]

Dandin divides the figure into thirty two varieties (II 15 50), perhaps the largest number of forms it has received in Sanskrit Poetics [4] An examination of them shows that the formula of classification followed is not at all scientific and logical His tendency to divide and sub divide the figure into various forms is more than evident, while he might have collected and collected laboriously, a good number of them from earlier tradition Such varieties may include *dharmopamā vastu-*, *ninda-*, *praśamsā-* and *asādhārana-* Of these forms the first two survived as *purna-* and *lupta-* respectively in later theorists [5] The next two varieties, evidently taken from Bharata,[6] could not become popular with the later writers Some other varieties

---

śabda or *ivaśruti* (II 227 234) cp esp his discussion of *limpatīva* etc (II 226 ff)

1 See above ch I on the concept of *upamā* in Yāska Pāṇini etc Bharata has five varieties of the figure, three of which were adopted by Daṇḍin see below

2 Cp BNS ChSS ed XVII 44

3 Cp Bhāmaha (II 30) Udbhaṭa (I 32) and Vāmana (IV 2 1) among early writers and Mammaṭa (KPr X k 87) Ruyyaka (AS k. 11 and *vṛtti*) and esp Viśvanātha (SD X 14) who defines *upamā* as the expressed similitude of two objects having common property in one sentence among later theorists The definition in SD keeps the figure apart from the allied figures like *rupaka vyatireka upamevopamā* and *ananvaya* cp *op cit vṛtti* For a detailed study of *upamā* cp B S Vyasa BSK I pp 91-149

4 The author of Agni-P (344 6-21) has as many as thirty six varieties in all His classification however is most confusing His second category of varieties of the figure are based on Daṇḍin s work cp S D Gyani *Agni-P A Study* pp 50-2 72-3

5 Cp KPr X k 87 SD X 15-7 Daṇḍin describes only the *dharmalupta-* he admits *vācakopadalupta-* also in II 61

6 BNS XVII 51 2

too, might have been current in tradition which the author seems to have unscrupulously followed Many of the forms are superfluous and are variations merely based, in his own words, on a number of possible cases[1] Such varieties are *niyamopamā*, *aniyama-*, *samuccaya-*, *virodha-*, *caṭu-*, *asambhāvita-* and *hetu-* which were, for good reasons, dropped in later theory, along with some other unimportant forms such as *ācikhyāsā-* and *pratiṣedha-* The interaction of simile with other figures has also resulted into the formation of varieties like *śleṣa-* and *samāna-* which have been framed by the blending of ideal and verbal *slesa* respectively Again, there are forms which can be either identified with, or included in the scope of, other figures The *atiśaya-*, for instance is identifiable with *vyatireka*, while *abhuta-* and *vikriya-* which are based on fancy, may be comprehended within the scope of *utprekṣā* Similarly, the *tulyayoga-* can be regarded as a mere variation of Daṇḍin's own figure *tulyayogitā* A good number of varieties however, whether they were traditional or were the product of the writer s own ingenuity, survive in later theory either as varieties as in Daṇḍin or as independent figures The forms which remained as such are *dharma-* *vastu-* *vakyartha-* and *māla-* the last having been conceived quite differently[2] The varieties which were either promoted to independent status or attached, as varieties to other poetic figures are more interesting to note Of these forms, the *viparyasa-* developed into *pratipa* *anyonya-* into *upameyopamā* (reciprocal comparison) *utprekṣita-* into a variety of *pratipa*, *adbhuta-* into the form of *atisayokti* where there is statement of connection when it actually does not exist, *moha-* into *bhrantimat*, *samśaya-* into *samdeha*, *nirnaya-* and *tattvakhyāna-* (which are comparable to each other)[3] into *niscaya* *asadharana-* into *ananvaya* *bahu-* into *malopama* and

---

1 KA II 96

2 *Daṇḍin s bahupamā is the mālopamā of later time while his mālopamā* approximates to the later *rasanopamā*

3 *Nirnayopamā* can be identified with *samdeha* ending in *niścaya* (SD X 36) and *tattvākhyāna-* with *bhrāntāpahnuti* (cp Kuval I 29) *Tattvākhyāna-* has been regarded as a direction of employment of simile by Vāmana (IV 2. 7)

pratnastu- into the figure of the same name [1] Of these varieties *samśaya-* which is comparable to Bharata s *lakṣana* named *samśaya*,[2] and the *asadharana-* which is in the form of *sadṛsi upamā* in Bharata[3] had attained independent status even in Dandin s own time,[4] while the *anyonya-* received that position as early as Bhāmaha, in the form of *upameyopamā* [5]

Daṇḍin gives an exhaustive list of the words and phrases sixty four in number, which signify the idea of similarity (II 57-65) A cursory examination of the list brings out the fact that similitude can be either expressed or implied It is expressed by the words *iva*, *vat*, *va*, *yathā*, *samāna*, *nibha sannibha tulya*, *samkāśa*, *nikasa* and *prakāsa* and by the words beginning with *sadṛs* and ending with *tulita* in the list Of these, the words, *iva vā yathā* and *vat* bring about what Mammaṭa and Visvanātha etc call the *srauti* simile, while the *arthi* simile is formed by the use of the words, *tulya*, *samāna* etc [6] The idea of comparison is implied when the words *pratirupaka* etc (up to *virodhin*) and verbs and verbal phrases, *spardhate* etc (up to *tasyānukaroti*) are employed On the basis of the meaning they convey, these words or phrases can be classified as under (a) words of direct comparison, as *iva* etc and (b) words or phrases implying similitude by denoting either (i) opposition, (ii) challenge or victory, (iii) derision by or (iv) jealousy of the object of comparison with regard to the standard thereof

1 Cp for detail SD X 26 36 39 46–7 49–50 87 The form *pratnastu pamā* receives independent position after Bhāmaha who like Daṇḍin includes it in his *upamā* (II 34) and a slightly changed exposition in and after Udbhaṭa (I 51) and Vāmana (IV 3 2) cp KPr X k 101–2 AS k 25 *vṛtti* SD X 49–50

2 BNS XVII 1

3 BNS XVII 54 from *sadṛśī upamā* it gradually developed into *asādhāranopamā* (in Daṇḍin) and finally into *ananvaya* or *-upamā* which term Daṇḍin also knows (KA II 358) cp BKAl II 45 KPr X k 91 AS k 12 *vṛtti* SD X 26

4 Cp KA II 358 Bhāmaha treats them separately (III 43–5) *Sasamdeha* came later as *samdeha* (cp KASV IV 3 11 SD X 36) though KPr (X k 92) retains the old name

5 BKAl III 37-8 also cp KPr X k 91 AS k 13 *vṛtti* SD X 27

6 Cp KPr X k 87 *vṛtti* SD X 15 6

3 *Rupaka* (metaphor) has been defined by Dandin as the form of simile where the difference between the object of comparison and the standard thereof is set aside (II 66),[1] or in other words, the *upameya* is represented as identical with the *upamana*

From Bharata to Viśvanātha, we do not observe any basic difference in the conception of the figure, though the theorists superficially differ in their exposition of the figure The implicit similitude of Bharata as also of Udbhata the superimposed identity of *upameya* with *upamāna* of Bhamaha, Vamana, Mammaṭa and Ruyyaka and the superimposition of *upamana* on *upameya* of Visvanātha denote the same basic conception of *rupaka*[2] The figure resembles the *guna, samādhi* from which Danḍin means to distinguish it on the ground that while in the figure superimposition is based on similitude in the *guna* it is based on the compliance with the worldly usage, though it may have been chiefly caused by the idea of similitude itself

Like *upamā* it has been divided into various forms numbering twenty in all (II 67 95) Here also his classification is not based on any sound principle The first three varieties, *samasta-*, *asamasta-* and *samastavyasta-* have been formed merely on the basis of compounds, and the later theorists have justly ignored them with a passing reference only[3] The subsequent eight forms (from *sakala-* to *saviseṣana-*) were adopted in later theory, but with considerable reshuffle and modification since their treatment in Danḍin was unsystematic The *sakala-* and *avayava-* become *sangarupaka* in later theorists, resembling its two forms *samastavastuviṣaya* and *ekadesa vivartin* respectively,

---

1 The concept is as old as Yāska who calls it *luptopamā* (elliptical simile), cp above ch I also cp S S Janaki AS intro p 72

2 Cp BNS XVII 57 8 BKAI II 21 2 KASS I 21 KASV IV 3 6 KPr X k 93 AS k 15 SD X 28 Agni-P (344 23) adopts Danḍin s definition also cp ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 412 For a detailed study of the figure cp B S Vyasa BSK I pp 163 181

3 Cp SD X 33 f Bhoja (SKA IV 27 ŚPr X Josyer ed II pp 412 3) however admits them along with other forms of Danḍin and cites most of his illustrations

noticed for the first time in Bhāmaha[1] The forms *ekanga-*, *dvanga-* etc are just unwarranted divisions of *avayava-*, as also the two varieties *yukta-* and *ayukta-*, based on the appropriateness or otherwise of the superimposition The *avayavi-* is the *nirangarūpaka* of the later writers[2] The *savisesana* is comparable to Dandin s own *sakala-* in which it may well be included The *visamā-*, again, which is a combination of *niranga-* and *ekadesavivartin* is an uncalled for variety The remaining forms of *rupaka*, excepting *samādhāna-*, are the result of its communion with other figures namely *virodha hetu slesa upamā, vyatireka, ākṣepa, apahnuti* and, lastly, the *rupaka* itself In many of these combinations the presence of *rupaka* is unimportant The *hetu-* is just a futile variation and in its example the idea of similitude is more prominent than that of superimposition In *viruddha-*, *virodha* (which in fact is *viṣama*)[3] has no connection whatsoever with *rupaka* The *upama-* was in Daṇḍin's own time an independent figure, and by Bhāmaha, too, it has been referred to as such[4] In *vyatireka-* where *vyatireka* is more important than *rupaka* the two figures stand apart, and as its example shows it is verily the independent *vyatireka* figure[5] The *samadhana-* is comparable to *viruddha-* it is in fact the figure *viṣama* (with solution) of the later theorists *Rupaka-* is just a case of double superimposition which has no strikingness about it The *tattvapahnava-* is identical with *apahnuti* According to the later writers it is not *rupaka* at all because in later theory, there is no scope of concealment (*apahnava*) in *rupaka*[6] Thus out of the twenty forms only two varieties, namely *sakala-* and *avayavi-* got acceptance in later theorists in the form of *sangarupaka* (*samastavastuvisaya*) and *nirangarupaka* respectively while the third *avayava-* a sub variety of *sakala-*

1 BKAI II 22 Bhāmaha has only these two varieties Also cp KPr k 93 f AS k 15 *vrtti* SD X 30-2 The ex ताम्रागुलिदल etc of *sakala rupaka* (KA II 69) seems to have inspired the later figure *pariṇāma* (cp AS k 16 SD X 34-5) cp S S Janaki AS intro pp 77 78 ff
2 Cp KPr and SD *loc cit*
3 Cp SD X 69 Daṇḍin does not know *viṣama*
4 Cp KA II 358 and BKAI III 35
5 Cp SD X 52 KA II 180
6 Cp KPr X k 93 *vrtti* AS k 15, SD X 28

was retained as *ekadesavivartin* Other forms were either abandoned or retained in the form of *samsṛṣṭis*

4 *Dipaka* (illuminator or zeugma) is the figure where a word (either a subject or predicate) remaining at one place helps the entire sentence (II 97) *The word* may be indicative of genus, action, quality or individual and on this basis, the figure has been divided into four varieties (II 98 101) Again, *the word* may occur either in the beginning or in the middle or at the end this serves another basis of division (II 102 7), though it cannot be regarded as scientific one [1] The third basis of classification is the repetition which may be of either sense or word or of both of them This *repetition* has been registered as a separate figure by name *āvṛtti* of course, of the *dipaka* class (II 116)

Among other forms (II 108 15), the *ekārtha-* can very well be included in the *āvṛtti* of sense while *sliṣṭārtha-* is merely a case of the figure s interaction with *śleṣa* The important variety of the figure is *mālādipaka* (II 108) which won common acceptance in later theory [2] Daṇḍin does not notice the later variety *kārakadipaka* (case illuminator) where a case (*kāraka*) illuminates several verbs in succession, but it can be observed in its crude form in various examples of his *dipaka* [3]

Dipaka is a traditional figure Bharata defines it,[4] though he is not aware of its numerous forms which we notice in Daṇḍin The sub figure *āvṛtti* seems to be an invention of the writer himself, for his immediate predecessors do not know it In later theory, it appears in some writers either as a mere variety of *dipaka*[5] or in the form of *āvṛttidipaka* with indepen

1 Early writers like Bhāmaha (II 25) Udbhaṭa (I 28) and Vāmana (IV 3 19) admitted this basis but later writers rightly rejected it cp SD X 49 f

2 Cp KPr X k 104 AS k 55 *vṛtti* SD X 76-7 (as an independent figure) Bhoja [ŚPr X p 474 (Josyer ed II)] cites Daṇḍin s ex of *mālā-* as an instance of *ekāvalī*

3 Cp KA II 98 103 etc ŚPr X, *Josyer* ed. II p 422 gives KA II 98 under *kāraka-dipaka* for *kāraka-*, cp KPr X k 103 AS k 24 *vṛtti* SD X 49

4 BNS XVII 60 his example illustrates Daṇḍin s *kriyā-*

5 Cp SKA IV 78 ŚPr X Josyer ed. II p 423 KPr X k 103 f, SD X

dent status The later figure, *samuccaya* which appears for the first time in Rudrata is also an offshoot of *dīpaka*[1] The basic conception of the figure remains unchanged throughout, though we observe the addition of the element of similitude in it in writers from Udbhata onward[2] The figure was finally conceived as association of the object of comparison and the standard thereof with one common property or as a figure in which several attributes, some relevant (*prastuta*) and some irrelevant (*aprastuta*) are predicated to the same object[3]

5 *Ākṣepa* (denial) is the statement of denial of anything (II 120) According as it refers to past or present or future it is classified into three forms *vṛtta-* *vartamāna-* and *bhaviṣyad-* (II 121 6) On the basis of the objects to be denied it may be divided into infinite varieties, and we find twenty one cases noticed by Dandin (II 126 68) An examination of these forms shows that all of them are not based on the objects negatived many of them are formed quite arbitrarily Only seven varieties *viz*, *dharma-*, *dharmi(n)-*, *karana-* *karya-*, *śliṣṭa-* (which in fact is the denial of the standard of comparison), *saṁśaya-*[4] and *arthantara-* refer to the things to be denied Of the remaining varieties, twelve (from *anujñā-* to *anukrośa-*) refer to one and the same object to be contravened namely, the journey abroad of the lover, which has been revoked in diverse ways including the ideas of permission command and sullen indifference and the like giving the names to different forms Evidently these ideas are not the objects of denial The *anuśaya-* expresses just repentance while the *hetu-* is the apparent negation of praise with a reason and its example better illustrates *vyajastuti*

From the analysis of the various forms of *akṣepa*, it follow

---

48 9 in Kuval I 49 50 however it is an independent figure

1 Cp RKAI VII 27 8 VIII 103-4 also cp SD X 84-5 see J S pathi DSKI pp 308 ff for detail

2 Cp Udbhata (KASS I 28 but DhAL I 13 *vṛtti* p 121 quotes *Udbhatavivaranakṛt* saying that *dīpaka* is not always accompanied by *upamā*) cp KASV IV 3 18 9 RKAI VII 64 KPr X k 103 AS k 24 *vṛtti* SD X 48 9 etc

3 Cp KPr X k 103 SD X 48 9

4 In the form of the negation of doubt it approximates to *saṁdeha* ending in certainty cp its example II 163 with SD X 35-6

that the writer had a confused conception of the figure which, after him, underwent a constant conceptual change[1] The basis of many of the directions of change may be traced in the varied forms of the figure and especially their examples in Daṇḍin The wide scope of the figure in the form of denial of anything in Daṇḍin suffered restriction and demarcation in various ways in later theory The first stage of its conceptual development we notice in his immediate successor, Bhāmaha who defines it as the paraleipsis or apparent denial of the desired object with a view to signifying special meaning[2] Udbhaṭa, Mammaṭa, Ruyyaka, Viśvanātha and others follow this concep tion,[3] while Vāmana develops a new one, according to which the figure consists in the negation or inutility of the standard of comparison in the presence of the object thereof[4] The basis of this conception lies in Daṇḍin s *śliṣṭa-* which in fact is the negation of the standard of comparison with a pun[5] Vāmana adds another explanation according to which *akṣepa* is the figure where the standard of comparison is indirectly hinted at The exposition, however, is far fetched and it unsuccessfully tries to approximate it to the figure *samasokti* According to the *Dhvanikara*, as Jagannātha evidences[6] all suggestive nega tion or denial comes within the scope of the figure which in this case virtually enters the sphere of the poetry of subordi nate suggestion (*gunibhutavyangya*)[7] The element of suggestion is frequently noticed in the examples of the figure in Daṇḍin[8] and the view of the *Dhvanikara* seems to have been inspired by

---

1 Cp De HSP II pp 70-1 also see above ch VI

2 BKAI II 67 8 The seed though indistinct of the element of apparency (*ābhāsa*) is traceable in Daṇḍin s example of *hetu-* (II 168)

3 Cp KASS II 2 3 KPr X k 106-7 AS k 38 *vṛtti* SD X 64-5

4 Cp KASV IV 3 27 and *vṛtti*

5 Cp KA II 159-60 also the ex of *vartamāna-* (II 123)

6 Cp RG pp 421 ff

7 It is probably with reference to such views that Agni P (345 14) identi fies *ākṣepa* with *dhvani* cp also De HSP II pp 70 ff

8 Cp examples of his *anādara-*, *paruṣa-* *yatna-*, *paravaśa* *upāya-* *roṣa-* *murcchā-* and *anukrośa* It may be noted that the ex. of his *anādara-* (II 139) has been cited as an instance of *vastudhvani* by Hema candra (KAn, pp 37 8)

his examples In the period that followed, the scope of the figure widened, and in Ruyyaka, Vidyādhara and Viśvanātha etc, the case of apparent permission (*vidhyābhasa*) of what is not desired also came, along with Bhāmaha's exposition, within the purview of the figure[1] The new trait appears to have been based on some of the forms of the figure in Daṇḍin, namely, *anujña-*, *āśīrvacana-*, and *sācivya-* where there is similar apparent permission of what is not otherwise desired Besides these conceptions, we have a new exposition in Appaya Dīkṣita who holds that the suppression or negation, after thought, of something really intended to be said (in order to convey a particular meaning) is also a case of *akṣepa*[2] The conception seems to have been inspired by Daṇḍin's *vṛtta-* and *arthāntara-* where a similar negation occurs

It follows from the above discussion that Daṇḍin's treatment of the figure though confused and unscientific in itself, served as the basis for the later theorists and it constitutes, therefore, an essential string for grasping the multifaced development of its conception in later times

6 *Arthantaranyasa* (corroboration) is the figure where some other matter is adduced for corroborating the thing under reference (II 169) Owing to the diversity of the corroborating material it can be divided into numerous varieties of which eight forms have been exemplified by the author (II 170 9) According as the supporting factor is either universally applicable or refers only to a particular case, the first two varieties, namely, *viśvavyapin* and *viśeṣastha* have been formed The next two species, *śleṣaviddha* and *virodhavat* are the result of its interaction with *śleṣa* and *virodha* respectively The remaining four varieties have been formed arbitrarily, though it is important to note that three of them namely, *ayuktakarin*, *yuktatman* and *viparyaya* seem to have inspired the later figures *viṣama sama* and *arthapatti* respectively,[3] while the *yuktayukta* is a combination of *sama* and *viṣama*

---

1 Cp esp AS k 39 *vṛtti* and SD X 65 where Daṇḍin's ex. of *āśīrvacana-* (KA II 141) has been cited

2. Kuval I 73

3 Cp KPr X k 125 7, SD X 69-70, 71 and 83

In the basic conception of the figure, no change is noticed throughout the history of the poetic figures. Bhāmaha, Vāmana and others follow Dandin substantially while Bhoja adopts his definition of the figure *verbatim*.[1] The later expositors, however, present a somewhat developed conception of the figure; they classify the matter to be supported and the supporting factor into either general proposition and particular instance or the cause and the effect thereof.[2] The classification appears to have been inspired by Dandin's treatment, though his forms are based on the corroboration of particular instance by a general proposition only and not *vice versa*.

7 *Vyatireka* (contrast) is a statement of difference between two objects (the similarity of which is an established fact), it being either expressed or understood (II 180). According as the semblance is explicit or implied, the two main varieties of the figure, namely, *śabdopātta* and *pratīyamāna*, are formed. The two objects in the figure generally belong to two different classes, but sometimes they are homogeneous as in the last example (II 197) which illustrates, for that reason, the *sajāti-vyatireka* variety. Again the statement of difference can be made in two ways, viz., either by mentioning some distinct characteristic of one object or by referring to the different properties of both of them. The two species thus formed have been named *ekavyatireka* and *ubhayavyatireka* respectively (II 181-4). Two more varieties have been formed according as the statement refers either to a mere difference or to superiority of one object over the other (II 190-2). Besides, there are some varieties which have been formed by the commixture of the figure with *śleṣa*, *ākṣepa* and *hetu*. Thus there are as many as five different bases of classification of the figure. The writer has however tried to accommodate the numerous varieties formed on the above bases[3] only in ten examples (II 181-97).

---

1 Cp BhAl II. 71; KASV IV. 3. 21; SKA IV. 57; also cp ŚP X, XI, Josyer ed. II pp 421, 423.

2 Cp KPr X. k 109; AS k 35 vṛtti; SD X. 61-2. These writers again divide the figure into two forms according as the corroboration is made by comparison or contrast.

3 Viśvanātha (SD X. 52-4) enumerates 48 divisions of the figure formed

with the result that the bases and the species based thereon have become all indistinct and confused

The original conception of the figure remained unchanged with the only exception that in post-Daṇḍin writers the scope of the two objects has specifically been confined to the object of comparison and the standard thereof[1] Again, the later theorists incorporated the idea of representing *upameya* as superior to *upamāna* in their definitions, perhaps on the suggestion of Daṇḍin himself who alludes to this fact while explaining his examples,[2] though it is absent in his definition of the figure It is also noteworthy that superiority in his illustrations generally belongs to the *upameya*, just as we notice it in later theorists though in some of them we also observe the idea of presenting *upameya* as inferior to the *upamana*[3]

8 *Vibhāvana* (peculiar causation) is the figure where, after denying the generally accepted cause of an effect, another cause is adduced, or the effect is described as spontaneous or taking place in the absence of its usual cause (II 199)

In later theory, we notice no change in the basic conception of the figure, though it has gradually received a clearer exposition at the hands of the later writers who have generally stressed the point of spontaneity of the effect, in their definitions[4]

9 *Samāsokti* (concise speech) consists in the depiction of an object not at hand but similar to the object intended to be

---

on different bases many of which we notice in Daṇḍin In Bhoja (SKA III 32 3) also we have a better classification

1 Cp BKAl II 75 KASS II 12 8 KASV IV 3 22 SD X 52

2 Cp KA II 192 the *viśeṣanidarśana* of Bhāmaha (BKAl II 75) *guṇātirekitva* of Vāmana (KASV IV 3 22) *ādhikya* of Ruyyaka (AS k 28) and *vyatireka* of Mammaṭa (KPr X k 105) and Viśvanātha (X 52) connote the same idea of superiority of *upameya* Daṇḍin s *atiśayopamā* where *atiśaya* signifies superiority is in fact the *vyatireka* figure

3 Cp Rudraṭa RKAl VII 86 ff Kuval I 57 and *vṛtti* AS k 28 *vṛtti* SD X. 52. [illegible] variety cp

4 Cp BKAl [illegible] (SKA III 9 also cp ŚPr X Josyer ed. II p 395) and the author of Agni P (344 27 8) however accept Daṇḍin s definition *verbatim*

described (II 205) The similarity of the objects, caused by the use of pun, may be due either to some similar action or to some alike attribute, and on this basis, the figure is divided into two forms, namely *tulyakāryā* and the *tulyaviśeṣanā* (II 206 8) Another sub variety, *bhinnabhinnaviśeṣana* is formed when some of the attributes are dissimilar (II 208 210) Besides, there is a variety called *apurva* where the object at hand abandons its previous characteristics (II 212 3)

The theorists widely differ in their conception of the figure While some writers following the line of Danḍin, define it as the description of *aprastuta* (standard of comparison) conveying a veiled reference to *prastuta* (the object of comparison),[1] others, and especially the later theorists, hold that it is the depiction of *prastuta* implying an allusion to the *aprastuta*[2] This conception of the figure approximates, on one hand to Danḍin s *guna samādhi* and Vāmana s figure *vakrokti* and, on the other, to the figure *aprastutaprasamsā* of the later theory[3] In Danḍin, however, the figures *samāsokti* and *aprastutapraśamsā*, are distinct from each other, the former describing *aprastuta* in order to imply the *prastuta* and the latter commending *aprastuta* with a view to conveying a derision of *prastuta* But the later conception of *aprastutaprasamsa* cannot be very well distinguished from the older scope of *samāsokti*,[4] and it was perhaps for this reason that the later theorists entirely reversed the conception of the latter

10 *Atiśayokti* (hyperbole) is the expression of something special transgressing the ordinary limit of worldly usage (II 214) The writer stamps *atiśayokti* as the best of figures and

1 Cp Vāmana (IV 3 3 *vṛtti*) Bhoja (SKA IV 46 ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 418) Mammaṭa (X 97) etc

2 Cp Appaya Dīkṣita (Kuval I 61) Viśvanātha (SD X 56 and *vṛtti*) the latter however expresses the idea in a different way also cp AS k 31 *vṛtti* Among earlier writers cp Bhāmaha (II 79) whom the author of Agni P (345 17) follows

3 Cp KA I 93, KASV IV 3 8 for *aprastuta*— see below

4 It is to be noted that Bhoja (SKA IV 49) considers *anyokti* (in later theory a form of *aprastutapraśamsā*) to be a variety of *samāsokti* and cites as illustration Danḍin s ex of *samāsokti* (II 206)

regards it as an element which brightens up other figures[1] Although he does not divide it formally, he notices some general cases of its occurrence involving doubt, ascertainment or extensiveness of the container (*āśraya*) which last case seems to have developed into the later figure, *adhika*[2]

The figure seems to be very old In Bharata, we have a *laksana* named *atisaya*[3] from which it appears to have been evolved In *Visnudharmottarapurana*, the figure gets an early recognition Although retaining the basic conception intact, the theorists succeeding Dandin give the figure various definitions with a distinct tendency to restrict its scope[4] The vast scope of *the extraordinary expression* which can very well accommodate the later varieties of the figure or even some independent figures of later times,[5] has been contracted in later theory into a denial of connection between two objects when it actually exists[6] This conception with restricted scope forms one of the varieties of later *atisayokti* while other forms of the figure in later theory are fresh innovations The restriction of the scope seems to be due to Daṇḍin s illustrations of the figure which are all of limited range Thus the seed of the contraction of the scope of the figure was sown by our writer A still narrower conception of the figure occurs in the theorists who confine it to the idea of the swallowing up of the object of comparison[7]

---

1 Cp KA II 214 270 also see ch VI

2 Cp KPr X k 128 SD X 72

3 BNS XVII 2

4 Bhāmaha (II 84) describes it as the expression of some extraordinary merit Vāmana (IV 3 10) conceives it as the imagination of some probable attribute and its excellence Bhoja (SKA IV 81 2 also cp ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 425) however borrows Daṇḍin s definition and cites his examples

5 Cp later varieties like *rupaka- sāpahnava- sambandha- asambandha- akrama- capala atyanta-* etc in Appaya (Kuval I 36-43) and others and the figures like *milita* (KPr X k 130 and esp Kuval I 146 which cites Daṇḍin s example of *atiśayokti*) or *nimīlita* (AS k 70 *vrtti*) and *adhika* (KPr X k 128 AS k 48 *vrtti* Kuval I 72) which are comprehended within the scope of Daṇḍin s figure

6 Cp SD X 46-7

7 KPr X k 100 f AS k 22 SD X 46

11 *Utprekṣā* (poetical fancy) is the figure where a particular condition or action of an animate or inanimate object is fancied in a different way (II 221) It is usually expressed by the words, *manye*, *śanke*, *dhruvam*, *prāyah*, *nunam* and *iva* [1] No distinct classification of the figure has been made by the author His two examples, however which refer to animate and inanimate objects respectively (II 222 224) appear to have inspired the later varieties like *phala-* and *hetu-* [2]

We notice a gradual process of refinement in the exposition of the figure, though it retained its original character intact throughout The definitions of the figure given by Bhāmaha and Vāmana,[3] however close to Dandin s exposition present comparatively a developed form The later writers such as Mammata and Visvanātha define it still more scientifically as the supposition (*sambhāvana*) of the identity of the object of comparison and the standard thereof [4] Of the numerous varieties of the figure in later theory we have scarcely any trace in the earlier writers

While dealing with the figure, Dandin makes an interesting reference to a current topic of controversy The famous half verse, लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि वर्षतीवाञ्जनं नभः । (II 226) (darkness smears, as it were the limbs, the sky is raining as it were the collyrium) raises the polemical point whether it illustrates *upama* or *utpreksa* [5] The discussion which is full of arguments and counter arguments is a fine specimen of hair splitting in

---

1 KA II 234 the words generally mean *I suppose as if* or *as it were*

2 Cp SD X 43

3 Bhāmaha (II 91) defines it as the supposition of a different quality or action on that of a particular object Vāmana s (IV 3 9) definition also refers to the same conception.

4 Cp KPr X k 92 SD X 40 also cp KASS III 47 Bhoja (SKA IV 50) and the author of Agni P (344 24-5) however adopt Dandin s definition. Viśvanātha deals at length with its species and sub-species numbering 176 in all also cp Ruyyaka (AS k. 21) for a detailed discussion of the figure

5 KA II 226-33 The question has also been discussed by Bhoja (SKA V 176 f ŚPr XI Josyer ed. II pp 434-5) Ruyyaka (AS k 21 *vrtti*) etc. also cp Kane notes on SD pp 147 9 S S Janaki AS intro, pp. 110-11 Jaya Shankar Tripathi DSKI pp 357-60

the field of Rhetoric What the author wants to establish is that the verse does not contain *upamā*, since its essential requisites, viz the object of comparison (in its proper meaning) and the standard thereof as also the common property, are absent here [1] only the word expressive of similitude namely *iva* is present, but it is indicative of *utprekṣā* also Finally Daṇḍin rules that the verse illustrates the figure, *utpreksa*, because the particular act of smearing has been fancied herein in a different way, that is, it has been supposed to have been caused on the limbs by darkness [2]

12 *Hetu* (cause) consists in the striking expression of the cause of an action [3] Daṇḍin regards the figure, along with *sukṣma* and *lesa* as the best embellishment of speech (II 235)

The figure has been divided into *kāraka-* (efficient cause) and *jñapaka-* (logical cause) The *karaka-* has again been divided into three forms on the basis of the threefold division

---

1 He argues that *limpati* (sm ars) cannot be the standard of comparison since there can be no comparison with a verbal form as the scholars (cp MBhaṣ III 1 7) say If for the sake of argument it is regarded as the standard of comparison then the question of common property would arise for without it there can be no simile If *smearing* be the common property what the *limpati* which is identical with *sm aring* would b ? After all it cannot be both th common property and the one possessing it If the common property is said to be implied here as in *the face is like the moon* the implied common property here being beauty the question arises what common property could be implied in *limpati* except the same *smearing* ? To say that darkness b smears the limbs like *one who besmears* is also not correct for the agent (*kartṛ*) that is just implied in the verb (being reduced to the position of an adjective) cannot perform the function of the standard of comparison as it is engaged in its own task of *besmearing* Moreover when *besmearing* is regarded as an action of the agent independently of the object (*karman* or *vyāpya*) the word *aṅgāni* (limbs) denoting the Accusative becomes disconnected cp KA II 226-32 and the comms Taruṇa Hṛd and esp Ratna also cp Kuval I 33 *vṛtti*

2 As Ruyyaka (AS k 21 *vṛtti* p 71) Mammaṭa (KPr X k 91 *vṛtti*) and Viśvanātha (SD X 45 f) etc observe darkness which does not besmear the limbs has been supposed here to do so It is thus an example of *vastūtprekṣā* in later theory

3 This conception of the figure which has not been defined by him is hinted at in KA II. 237

of action (*karman*) into *nirvartya* (to be caused), *vikārya* (to be modified) and *prāpya* (to be attained)[1] The *jñāpaka*- has been sub-divided into *ārtha* (implicit) and *sabda* (explicit) Then follow the causes referring to *abhāva* (non existence) which is of four kinds namely, *pragabhāva* (non existence before birth) *pradhvamsabhāva* (non existence caused by destruction), *anyonyābhāva* (mutual non existence) and *atyantābhāva* (absolute non-existence)[2] The subsequent *bhāvabhava* (negation of non-existence) is virtually *bhāva* (existence) Again, Dandin refers to infinite varieties of *citrahetus* (unusual causes), and deals with some of them, namely *durakarya* (where the effect stands afar from the place of its cause) *kāryānantaraja* (where the cause comes after the effect) *ayuktakarya* (where the effect is contrary to its cause) and *yuktakārya* (where it is in tune with its cause) (II 253 9) The writer illustrates in all fifteen forms of the figure which seems to have originated from Bharata s *laksana* of the same name[3] After Dandin, some writers like Bhāmaha and Vāmana rejected or at least ignored the figure[4] Udbhata, who does not refer to it develops its *kāraka* variety into an independent figure named *kavyalinga* or *kāvyahetu* which wins wide recognition in later theory[5] The *jñāpaka* variety appears in later writers in the form of *anumāna* figure[6] The *abhāvahetus* were generally abandoned by later theorists though they attracted the notice of some writers like Bhoja[7] The *citrahetus* manifest themselves in various forms in later theory, the *durakārya* assumes the form of *asamgati* and the *tatsahaja* and *karyanantaraja* are adjusted in *atisayokti* in the form of *akramāti*

---

1 KA II 240 cp Vākya III 45 f which the author seems to have drawn upon cp Ratna also

2. KA II 246–52. These forms have been taken from the *Naiyāyikas* cp *Tarkasamgraha* (ed. Nrsimhadeva Sastri) pp 64–5

3 BNS XVII 1

4 Bhāmaha (II 86–7) rejects it along with *suksma* and *lesa* while Vāmana does not refer to it at all Mammata (KPr X k 119 *vrtti*) also rejects it

5 Cp KASS VI 1 KPr X k 114 AS k 57 *vrtti* SD X 62, etc.

6. Appaya Kuval (ed. B S. Vyasa) p 276 KPr X k 117, SD X. 63, etc.

7 SKA II 16–7 III 12 f also cp ŚPr X Josyer ed. II p 396

sayokti and *atyantātiśayokti* respectively, while the species, *ayuktakārya* and *yuktakārya* develop into the figures, *viṣama* and *sama* respectively [1]

Meanwhile, the figure develops a new conception which appears as early as Rudraṭa who defines it as the expression of identity of the cause and its effect [2] The conception which almost ousted Daṇḍin s one establishes itself entirely on a different ground

13 *Sukṣma* (subtle) is the meaning indicated delicately by gesture or facial expression, secret meeting with her lover at night is meant when the beloved closes the lotus petals before him, and desire for sexual pleasure is signified when there is a blush on her face (II 260 4)

The figure appears for the first time in Daṇḍin Bhāmaha rejects it on account of its being devoid of *vakrokti*,[3] while Udbhaṭa and Vamana ignore it Later theorists generally retain the figure intact along with its original conception [4] Appaya Dīkṣita, however, divides its scope into two figures, *sukṣma* and *pihita* [5]

14 *Leśa* (slight trace) is the concealment, under some pretext of a thing that has almost come to light (II 265) According to another view quoted by Daṇḍin, praise or censure presenting contrary appearance also come within the purview of the figure (II 268) This conception, however, does not appear to have been patronised by him, for he has given another figure,

---

1 Cp KPr X k 124 SD X 69 for *asaṁgati* Kuval I 41 and 43 for the forms of *atiśayokti* which have been comprehended in one variety in KPr (X k 101) and SD (X 47) Also cp Hemacandra (KAn p 223) who cites Daṇḍin s ex of *kāryānantaraja* as an instance of *akramatva doṣa* becoming a *guna* in *atiśayokti* and Bhoja (SKA I 140) who cites it under *apakrama* becoming a *guṇa* in *citrahetu* For *viṣama* and *sama* cp KPr X k 125 7 AS k 45-6 SD X 69–70 Kuval I 92

2. Cp RKAl VII 82 also cp Kuval I 167-8 SD X 63 Appaya gives another exposition according to which the figure consists in the depiction of the cause as synchronising with its effect

3 BKAl II 86

4 Cp SKA III 21 ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 393 KPr X k 122 AS k 75 *vṛtti* SD X 91 etc

5 Cp Kuval I 151-2

by name *vyājastuti*, with almost a similar scope [1]

The figure seems to have developed from Bharata's *lakṣaṇa* of that name, though its second form resembles in substance his *lakṣaṇas*, *guṇātipāta* and *garhaṇa* [2] Again, it is absent in *Viṣṇudharmottarapurāṇa* which has, however another figure named *upanyāsa* closely comparable to it In post Daṇḍin period, Bhāmaha repudiates it, while Udbhaṭa and Vāmana take no notice of it The two different views regarding the figure, which we notice in Daṇḍin, are represented in later theory by the figures, *vyājokti* and *vyājastuti* respectively,[3] though in Bhoja, the first conception has been assigned to the figure *apahnuti* [4] Bhoja, Appaya Dīkṣita and Jagannātha conceive the merit and demerit presenting contrary appearance as the scope of the figure in order to distinguish it from *vyājastuti*,[5] though the point of distinction cannot be held to be satisfactory

15 *Yathāsaṁkhya* (relative order), also called *saṁkhyāna*[6] and *krama*, consists in the arrangement of words in a particular order, so that they may refer, in the same sequence, to the things already enumerated (II 273)

Vāmana, due to his peculiar viewpoint of attaching the element of similitude to his figures, conceives it as the relative enumeration of objects of comparison and the standards thereof, perhaps on the suggestion of Daṇḍin's example of the figure (II 274) where however, *upameyas* and *upamānas* have come by chance [7] The general conception of the figure remains the

---

1 KA II 343-7 it however refers to only one phase i e praise manifesting itself as censure

2 Cp BNS XVII 2-4

3 Cp *vyājokti* in KASV IV 3 25 KPr X k 118 AS k 76 *vṛtti* SD X 92 Kuval I 153 for *vyājastuti* cp SKA IV 56 ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 420 KPr X k 112 SD X 59 60 Kuval I 70

4 Cp SKA IV ex (of *apahnuti*) 82-3 which are KA's II 266 7 (ex of *leśa*)

5 Cp ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 423 also Kuval I 138 and *vṛtti* which quotes KA II 269 and 271 admitting a *saṁkara* of *leśa* and *vyājastuti* there

6 Cp KA II 273 according to Bhāmaha (II 88) this name was given to the figure by Medhāvin

7 Cp KASV IV 3 17 KA II 274

same throughout [1] Some writers like Kuntaka and Jayaratha, however, disclaim the figure for it does not suit their peculiar standpoint [2]

16 *Preyas* (dearer) is the expression of sweet and exalted compliment born of devotion and causing pleasure (*prīti*) (II 275-9) The pleasurable sensation may be felt either both by the addresser and the addressee or by the former only The writer distinguishes *prīti* from *rati*, though he implies some proximity between the two Tarunavācaspati defines *prīti* as affection with reference to gods, preceptors and elders,[3] it is in a way the dominant emotion of *preyas* as Dandin would have it, while *rati* (love) is the enduring emotion of the erotic sentiment. The writer treats *preyas* independently of the *rasavat*, perhaps because the latter in tradition did not comprehend the former within its scope

Dandin s conception of the figure is comparable to Bharata s *lakṣana, priyavacas* [4] In later theory, it was conceived as a subordinate form of *bhāva* (emotion) [5] just as the figure *rasavat* was considered to be the secondary form of *rasa* (senti ment) Thus from the narrow signification of *prīti* in early theorists, the figure received a wider conception of emotions in general, including those enduring as well as the transitory ones in later writers Inspiration for the change seems to have

1 BKAl II 89 KASS III 2 SKA IV 79 KPr X k 108 AS k 79 vrtti SD X 79 Kuval I 109

2 Cp VJ III (résumé in De s ed p 220 and fn)

3 Cp comm on KA II 275 and 280-1 The scope of *prīti* thus compre hends all aspects of non sexual love though Daṇḍin s examples refer only to its one aspect *viz* devotion to gods which fact leads V Raghavan (NR pp 107-10) to think that Daṇḍin s *preyas* is equivalent to *bhakti* which is synonymous with *prīti* But Daṇḍin s definition certainly does not set the limit and it is not fair to restrict the scope of his *preyas* on the basis of his examples which are of course of limited range It may be noted that Rudraṭa (XV 17-9) mentions *sneha* (by which he means love of friendship) as the dominant emotion of *preyas* which he stamps as *rasa*

4 BNS XVII 5

5 Cp KASS IV 5 AS k 82 vrtti SD X 96 f Appaya (Kuval I 170) calls it also *bhāvālamkāra*

come from the exposition of the figures, *preyas*, *rasavat* and *ūrjasvin* in Udbhaṭa[1] Bhoja, on the other hand, invents, on the model of the figure a *guṇa* of that name and relates it to flattery (*cāṭūkti*)[2] in which sense *preyas* lived long in later Rhetoric Besides, the figure develops into a new *rasa* in Rudraṭa,[3] perhaps on the suggestion of Daṇḍin's correlating it with the sentiment of love

17 *Rasavat* (possessed of sentiments) consists in exalted expression made charming by the sentiments which are the ripened forms of *sthāyibhāvas* (dominant emotions) in unison with other elements such as *vibhāva* (determinants), *anubhāva* (consequents) and *saṃcāribhāvas* (transitory emotions) (II 275, 281) On the basis of the number of *rasas*, the figure is divided into eight forms (II 281 91)

Daṇḍin inherits the *rasas* from earlier tradition as distinct from the poetic figures,[4] but due to his prepossessed attitude towards the figures, he relegates the *rasas* to subordinate position He is followed in this respect by Bhāmaha and Udbhaṭa[5] Later, the *rasa* theorists compromised with the situation by saying that the *rasas* assume the form of poetic figures when they come as subservient to other elements or emotions, other wise they retain their independent status[6] Bhoja channelises the figures, *preyas*, *rasavat* and *ūrjasvin* into two separate courses of figures and excellences, he maintains that the said figures retain their position as such only when they are possessed of exaltedness, in the absence of which they are reduced to the *guṇas*, *preyas*, *bhāvika* and *aurjitya* respectively[7] He relates,

---

1 Cp KASS IV 2 ff cp below for *rasavat* etc
2. SKA I 63 f, ŚPr IX Josyer ed II pp 341-2 acc to him (SKA KM ed. p 705 ŚPr XI Josyer ed II pp 436 7) the figures *preyas* etc when they are not possessed of exaltedness become *guṇas* also cp below
3 Cp RKAl XII 3 XV 17 9 also cp above
4 Cp Bharata (BNS VI 16 18) who elaborates *rasas* as independent elements belonging to drama
5 Cp BKAl III 6 KASS IV 4
6 Cp DhA II 5 *vṛtti* (pp 201-2) KPr IV k 26 *vṛtti* also cp AS k 82 *vṛtti* SD X 95 6 Kuval I 170 But Kuntaka (VJ III 11 *vṛtti*) vehemently rejects *rasavat* as a figure
7 SKA, KM ed pp 704 5 ŚPr XI Josyer ed II p 436-7

thus, the figure *rasavat* to the conception of *bhāvika* in his own peculiar way His curious theory seems to have been inspired by the remark of Daṇḍin that the three figures should be possessed of exaltedness (*utkarṣa*)[1]

18 *Ūrjasvin* (vigorous) is the exalted expression of pride or vigour (II 275) Bhāmaha follows this conception of the figure[2] In Udbhata however, we notice a change He relates the figure with emotions and sentiments coming up from impropriety,[3] and consequently in later theory the subordinate aspect of pseudo *rasas* (*rasābhasas*) and pseudo *bhāvas* (*bhāvabhasas*) was regarded as the sphere of this figure[4] As noted above, Bhoja takes its unexalted form as the *aurjitya guna*, while he develops a new *rasa* named *uddhata* on the suggestion of Daṇḍin s definition of the figure[5]

19 *Samahita* (co incidence) is concurrence of an act with another and its accomplishment by chance (II 298-9) Bhāmaha follows Daṇḍin in respect of this figure also[6] Vamana, due to his peculiar viewpoint noted above puts forth quite a new exposition he defines it as conversion by mistake of the object of comparison into the standard thereof[7] Udbhata, on the other hand, totally discarding the earlier conception, links it up with the allaying of sentiments and emotions and his theory wins general acceptance in the later writers[8] To accom modate Daṇḍin s conception of the figure a separate figure named *samādhi* was introduced in later theory[9]

20 *Paryayokta* (periphrastic speech) is the figure where the intended meaning is conveyed by some indirect device (II

---

1 Cp KA II 275 युक्तोत्कर्षं त्रयम् ।
2 Cp its ex in BKAl III 7 (for he does not d fine it)
3 Cp KASS IV 9
4 Cp AS k 82 *vṛtti* SD X 95-6 and *vṛtti* Kuval I 170
5 Bhoja (SKA V 166 f) employs Daṇḍin s definition and the example of the figure for his *uddhata rasa*
6 Cp BKAl III 10 Bhoja (SKA III 34 ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 394) also follows him
7 Cp KASV IV 3 29 and *vṛtti* for his p culiar viewpoint see under *yathāsamkhya*
8 Cp KASS IV 14 also cp AS k 82 *vṛtti* SD X 95-6 Kuval I 170
9 KPr X k 125 AS k 67 *vṛtti* SD X 85 Kuval I 118

295) The figure undergoes some conceptual change after Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha [1] The later theorists define it as the indication of the intended meaning by a turn of speech (*bhaṅgī*) [2] This conception seems to be the result of a different and perhaps more accurate, interpretation of Daṇḍin s *prakārāntarākhyāna* [3] Some theorists like Bhoja and Appaya Dīkṣita accepted both the expositions of the figure [4] Still another conception of the figure is observed in its exposition by Jayadeva [5] which, however could not win recognition in the theory

21 *Udātta* (exalted) is the figure which describes beautifully[6] either nobility of intention or supermundane prosperity The figure is comparable to Bharata s *lakṣaṇa, prasiddhi* [7] On the other hand, it partially resembles Daṇḍin s own *guṇa, udāratva* where also some excellent quality is implicitly depicted

The two forms of the figure retain themselves in later theory, with a slight change in respect of the second form [8] Udbhaṭa replaces the idea of nobility of intention by that of an action of a great man Again, subsequently, the idea of its representation as collateral to the subject in hand was suffixed to the conception [9]

22 *Apahnuti* (concealment) consists in denying something

---

1 Cp KA II 295 7 BKAl III 8

2 Cp Ruyyaka AS k 36 *vṛtti* Appaya Kuval I 69 Jayadeva Candrā V 66 also KPr X k 115 SD X 60

3 It should mean *conveying in a different manner or periphrastically* but the meaning ill suits the example I am going to drive the *kokila* bird away you two please stay here freely Appaya (Kuval I 69) introduces another form of the figure and defines it as accomplishment of one s object by some pretext evidently to accommodate the example better

4 Cp Kuval I 68 9 SKA IV 80

5 Candrā V 70

6 Cp KA 300 and 303 also cp KASS IV 17 where *upalakṣaṇatā* should be taken as antithesis of *itivṛttatva* (matter-of fact speech)

7 BNS XVII 4 cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 39 ff

8 Cp Bhāmaha (BKAl III 12) (referring only to its second form) for the two forms cp KPr X k 115 AS k 80 1, SD X 94 Kuval I 162

9 Cp SD X 94 The idea is apparently the result of wrong interpretation of Udbhaṭa s *upalakṣaṇatā* in the sense of *being collateral to the subject in hand* cp above

real and presenting in its place something else of unreal nature, evidently with a view to affirming it more strongly (II 304) Daṇḍin mentions the denial of attribute (*dharma*) quality (*viṣaya*) and form (*svarupa*) as its three varieties (II 305 8), while some other forms like *upamāpahnuti* and *tattvāpahnavarupaka* have been referred to by him in other contexts [1] He does not admit the element of similitude in the figure as is evident from his definition as well as the illustrations [2] But soon after him, the element was introduced by Bhāmaha, Udbhaṭa and Vamana who were followed in this respect by most of the later theorists [3]

23 *Śliṣṭa* (paronomasia) is the figure where words having identical form yield different meanings (II 310) The figure is very ancient Although Bharata does not mention it his *lakṣaṇas*, *aksarasaṃghāta* and *śobha* involve *double entendre* [4] The figure appears for the first time in the *Visnudharmottarapurāna*

Daṇḍin refers to its two main varieties, namely *abhinna pada* (where another meaning is obtained without dividing the word) and *bhinnapada* (where the word is split up in order that it yields another meaning) (II 310 2) The two forms were retained in later theory as *abhanga* and *sabhanga śleṣa* respec

---

1 Cp KA II 34 (along with II 309) and II 95 According to Appaya (Kuval I 29 *vrtti*) Daṇḍin s *tattvākhyānopamā* belongs to the sphere of *bhrantapahnuti* while to Bhoja (SKA IV 41-3 f ŚPr X Josyer ed. II p 420) the first form of *leśa* is the *anaupamyā apahnuti*

2. Forms like *pratiṣedhopamā* (II 34) which are the result of other figures interaction with *apahnuti* contain this element His ex of *tattvāpahnava rupaka* (II 94) also implies similitude

3 Cp BKAl III 21 KASS V 3 KASV IV 3 5 also cp RKAl VIII 57 AS k 33 *vrtti* (under *śleṣa*) Pratap p 273 (*Bālamanoramā Series*) *Citramimāṃsā* p 70 (KM ed.) RG p 365 (KM ed) Vidyādhara (*Ekāvalī* VIII 11) Visvanātha (SD X 37-8) and Viśveśvara [*Alamkāra Kaustubha* pp 235-6 (KM ed)] however ignore the element cp for detail S S Janaki AS intro pp 102-5 Bhoja (SKA IV 41-3 ŚPr X Josyer ed. II p 420) divides *apahnuti* into *aupamyavatī* and *anaupamyā* (with and without the element of similitude) As De (HSP II pp 101-2) points out some writers (cp Uddyota ed Candorkar p 39) introduce still another form of *apahnuti* named *gamyamānaupamyā* (where the comparison is implicit) also cp for the figure KPr X k 96 SD X. 38 For a detailed study of the figure cp B S Vyasa BSK, I pp 230-48

4 BNS XVII 1

tively [1] Of other forms (II 313-22), *viruddhakriya* and *virodhin* are evidently the result of its coalition with the figure *virodha*, while the *abhinnakriya* may be related to the figure *dīpaka* [2] Some varieties developed later into independent figures Thus *niyamavat* and *niyamākṣeparūpokti* assumed the form of *parisaṃkhyā* the latter having the intermixture of *ākṣepa* also while *avirodhin* can be regarded as the precursor of the later *punarukta vadābhāsa* [3] Besides the author speaks of its interaction with other figures, evidently as a beautifying element, which aspect of the figure we have already discussed

In the later period the figure was elaborated with more scientific acumen It was classified into verbal and ideal forms which appear perhaps for the first time in Bhāmaha [4] Daṇḍin is also unaware of the classification of the meanings the figure yields into that bearing on the context and that conveyed incidentally though some of his illustrations may exemplify the two classes In later theorists, the matter became the centre of an interesting controversy viz whether or not the concept of suggestion is essential for obtaining the incidental sense [5]

24 *Viśeṣokti* (statement of difference) is the representation of incongruous character (*vailakṣaṇya*)[6] of quality, genus, action or individual with a view to conveying some special meaning

1 Cp Hemacandra s KAn. p 277 KPr IX. k 84 *vṛtti* SD X. 92

2. Cp the example of *abhinnakriya* (II 316) with that of *Śliṣṭārthadīpaka* (II 113-4)

3. Cp the examples (II 319-20) with those of *parisaṃkhyā* in KPr X. k. 119 SD X. 81-2 etc. for *punarukta-* cp KPr IX. k 86 AS k 3 *vṛtti* SD X. 2

4 Cp BKAl III 17 also cp KPr IX. k 84 f AS k 3o *vṛtti* SD X. 11 57 Mammaṭa however considers *śleṣa* as a verbal figure only For the controversy whether *śleṣa* is a figure of word or of sense or of both cp P V Kane notes on SD pp 193-9 S. K. D HSP II pp 232-4 V Raghavan ŚPr pp 350 ff S S. Janaki AS intro pp 116-8

5 Mammaṭa holds the former view while Appaya defends the latter position see for detail Bhola Shankar Vyasa Hindi Kuval pp 100-2. The ex. of incidental sense in Daṇḍin is KA II 311 where the word *rāja* primarily meaning 'a king' incidentally yields the sense of 'moon also

6. The word should not be taken to mean *incompetency* as Vidyāsāgara has done since the meaning does not suit the examples.

(II 323) Daṇḍin illustrates in all its five varieties (II 324-8), four based on quality, genus etc and the fifth animated with the figure *hetu*, while scope for other forms has expressly been admitted (II 329)

Daṇḍin s conception of the figure could not win wide recognition in later theory which, however developed, on the inspiration of his view the figure *viṣama* [1] On the other hand, the later *vibhāvanā* approximates to his conception of *viśeṣokti*, the illustrations of which in him can well serve the purpose of the former figure and it is for this reason that Appaya Dīkṣita conceives his *vaikalya* (incongruous character) as the absence of the entirety of usual causes [2] Bhāmaha follows a different line He defines it as retention of the characteristics of an object even in the cessation of a substantial part thereof and, to add to the confusion, Vāmana introduces the element of similitude in the figure [3] Discarding earlier expositions a new conception arises in later theory according to which the figure consists in representing an effect as not taking place even in the presence of its usual cause [4] This conception seems to have been evolved from Bhāmaha s exposition

25 *Tulyayogita* (equal pairing) is the figure where the object under description and the objects having attributes similar to those of the former are represented side by side for the sake of either praising or censuring it (II 330) The figure approximates to the writer s own *tulyayogopamā* a variety of simile with the only difference that it contains the idea of praise or censure of the relevant object Earlier writers like Bhāmaha and Vamana virtually accept the variety of simile as their *tulya*

1 Cp KPr X k 126-7 AS k 45 *vṛtti* SD X 69 Bhoja (SKA IV 70) and the author of Agni-P (344 26-7) however adopt Daṇḍin s conception

2. Kuval I 78 and *vṛtti* For later *vibhāvanā* also cp KPr X k 107 AS k 41 *vṛtti* SD X 66

3 Cp BKAl III 23-4 Vāmana IV 3 23 (He defines it as the confirmation of similarity even when the object of comparison is devoid of a certain characteristic of the standard of comparison)

4 Cp Kuval I 83 KPr X k 108 AS k 42 *vṛtti* SD X 67 Viśvanātha cites Bhāmaha s ex of the figure under his *viśeṣokti*

yogitā[1] In later theory, we observe the noticeable change that the scope of the figure is confined to the connection, with the same common property of the objects which must either be all relevant (*prastuta*) or irrelevant (*aprastuta*) ones,[2] whereas in Dandin, the relevant and irrelevant objects are connected with one common property This conception of Dandin's *tulya-yogitā* is admitted in later theory as the proper sphere of *dīpaka*,[3] which however, does not contain the idea of praise or censure of the object under depiction Not only this, it even tends to enter the arena of his own *dipaka* inasmuch as the verb herein just as in *kriyadipaka* helps the entire sentence, itself remaining at one place

26 *Virodha* (incongruity) consists in the presentation of antithetical objects with a view to effecting strikingness in expression (II 333) Daṇḍin gives, without any specific classification, six illustrations (II 334 9) fifth of which suits the *viseṣokti* better than the present figure[4] Bhāmaha and Udbhaṭa follow, or rather improve upon, his definition, though they, along with Daṇḍin, fail to notice the essential element of apparency in the figure[5] Vāmana's definition recognises the element for the first time though his conception is so comprehensive that it tends to cover the other figures also based on apparent contradiction[6] His conception of the figure, however, establishes itself in later theory with, of course requisite restrictions The figure was finally conceived as an apparent incongruity consist-

---

1 Cp BKAl III 27-8 with KA II 331 KASV IV 3 26 Bhoja (SKA IV 54 f ŚPr X Josyer ed II pp 419-20) however follows Daṇḍin closely

2 Cp KPr X k 104 AS k 20 *vrtti* SD X 47-8 Appaya (Kuval I 45 7) refers to Daṇḍin's conception also

3 Cp SD X 48 and esp Kuval I 47 *vrtti*

4 Cp KA II 338 It may be pointed out that Appaya (Kuval I 78 *vrtti*) notes this example under Daṇḍin's *viśeṣokti*

5 Cp BKAl III 25 taken in KASS IV 9 Bhāmaha divides the figure into *kriya* and *guna virodha* which may be exemplified by KA's examples the first by II 334 337 and 338 and the second by the remaining ones He might have been inspired by Daṇḍin's examples Out of six examples of Daṇḍin only the last one (II 339) contains the element of apparency

6 Cp IV 3 12 his illustrations however exemplify the later *asamgati*,

ing in representing objects as antithetical to one another, albeit they are not so,[1] and it was finely elaborated into various divisions in later theory

27 *Aprastutaprasamsā* (indirect censure) is the figure where censure of the object under description is implied by the praise of some other object (II 340) The figure makes its first appearance in Dandin whom Bhāmaha follows in spirit His conception, however, was either dropped by later theorists or transferred to the figure *vyājastuti* which, on its part, received a wider interpretation at their hands[3] Vāmana gives a new exposition to the figure by defining it as a symbolic reference to the object of comparison by presenting another object similar thereto[4] In later period, we come across an entirely different conception of the figure which was defined as the description (and not *praise*) of *aprastuta* conveying a reference to the *prastuta*[5] This later conception is comparable to Dandin s *samasokti* or to Bhoja s *anyokti*, a variety of *samāsokti* in him[6]

28 *Vyajastuti* (artful praise) is the figure wherein praise is implied by apparent censure (II 343) The figure makes its first appearance in *Visnudharmottarapurana* in the form of *ninda stuti*, while Bharata s *lakṣana gunanuvāda* also is comparable to it[7] Daṇḍin s *vyājastuti* closely resembles the second conception of the figure, *lesa* though the latter s scope is wider inasmuch as it comprehends also the idea of censure implied by apparent praise Early writers like Bhamaha and Vamana follow Daṇḍin's exposition[8] but the later theorists subscribe to the wider conception of the figure which is embraced by his *leśa*, and it is

---

1 KPr X k 110 AS k 40 *vrtti* SD X 67-8 etc

2 BKAl III 29

3 Cp Kuval I 70-1 *vrtti* Mammata (KPr X k 112) comprehends both *aprastuta*– and *vyāja*– of Daṇḍin in his *vyājastuti*

4 Cp KASV IV 3 4

5 Cp KPr X k 98-9 AS k 34 *vrtti* Kuval I 66 *vrtti* SD X 58 9 etc

6 SKA IV 46-9 f It may be noted that when the earlier conception of *samāsokti* was transferred to *aprastutapraśamsā* its variety *anyokti* also joined the new class

7 Visnu III 14 13 BNS XVII 4

8 Cp BKAl III 31 KASV IV 3 24 (also cp his ex with KA II 344)

interesting to note that Bhoja expressly identifies the two figures [1] Appaya Dīkṣita still expands the scope of the figure by recognising its two forms, the first (*ekaviṣaya*) as comprehended by *leśa* and the second (*bhinnaviṣaya*) explained by him as the praise or censure of one implied by the censure or praise of another This second form of *vyajastuti* covers the scope of Danḍin s *aprastutaprasamsa* as admitted by Appaya Dīkṣita himself [2]

29 *Nidarsana* (illustrative simile) is the figure where a person or a thing engaged in a particular action points to a consequence, good or bad, similar to the action (II 348) The *nidarśana* appears in Bharata in the form of a *laksana* and the author of the *Viṣnudharmottarapurāna* knows it as a figure [3]

Danḍin's conception of the figure is adopted in substance by early writers like Bhāmaha and Vamana who, however, define it quite differently [4] In later theorists, the figure receives a wider range, it is defined as a figure where two correlated objects, whether their relationship is probable or otherwise, display the condition of the original and its counterfeit [5] The aspect dealing with the probable relationship corresponds to the earlier conception of the figure, while the second form is an innovation Appaya Dıkṣita describes three different forms of the figure, the last of which refers to Danḍin s conception, the remaining forms being later developments [6]

30 *Sahokti* (co mention) is the mention of qualities or actions of a thing as occurring together (II 351) The conception of the figure remains almost the same throughout, and the various expositions differ only superficially [7] According to

1 Cp KPr X k 112 AS k 37 *vrtti* SD X 59–60 also SKA IV 56 ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 420
2 Cp Kuval I 70–1 and *vrtti*
3 BNS XVII 2 Viṣnu III 14 14
4 BKAI III 33–4 KASV IV 3 20 also cp SKA III 31
5 AS k 27 *vrtti* SD X 51 Mammata (KPr X k 97) however has the aspect referring to the improbable relationship only
6 Cp Kuval I 53–6 and *vrtti*
7 Cp BKAI III 39 KASV IV 3 28 SKA IV 57–8 ŚPr X Josyer ed. II p 419 Agni-P 344 23 KPr X k 112 SD X 54-5

Bhāmaha *śleṣa* often accompanies the figure while Viśvanātha thinks that it must contain the element of exaggeration,[1] which Daṇḍin's examples do possess Ruyyaka incorporates the element of similitude in the figure [2]

31 *Parivṛtti* (barter) is the figure wherein there is an exchange of things (II 351) Although the basic conception of the figure did not change, its exposition received improvement at the hands of the later theorists[3] who classified the things exchanged into either equal or smaller or greater Bhoja introduced besides the idea of exchange that of *vyatyaya* (transfer from one place to another) [4] but his innovation failed to win general acceptance

32 *Āśis* (benediction) is the expression of good wishes for some coveted object (II 357) The figure already exists as a *lakṣana* in Bharata s work and Bhaṭṭi illustrates it, though it is absent in the *Viṣnudharmottarapurāṇa* Daṇḍin evidently admits it out of regard for tradition Bhāmaha disdains it [5] while Udbhaṭa, Vāmana and almost all the later writers drop it altogether Kuntaka rightly derides those who treat it as a poetic figure [6]

THE CONCEPT OF BHĀVIKA

At the end of the treatment of ideal figures Daṇḍin refers to a poetic figure named *bhāvika* (II 363–66) He also terms it as an excellence pervading the whole composition (*prabandhaviṣaya guṇa*) and for the evident reason, does not illustrate it Evidently he inherited the concept from earlier tradition but we do not know what exact position this *alaṃkara guṇa* occupied before him It is possible however, that it

---

1 Cp BKAl III 17 (three-fold division of *śleṣa* into *sahokti*– *upamā*- and *hetu*–) SD *loc cit*

2 Cp AS k 29 *vṛtti*

3 Cp BKAl III 41 KASV IV 3 16 KPr X k 113 AS k 61 *vṛtti* SD X 80 Kuval I 112 etc All the above writers except Bhāmaha divide the figure into three forms

4 Cp SKA III 29 ŚPr X Josyer ed. II pp 400 1

5 BKAl III 55-6

6. Cp VJ III (cp resume in De s ed p 220)

enjoyed an independent status, along with the *mārga guṇas*, in the form of an excellence applicable to the whole composition, for it is significant to note that Daṇḍin places it after the *saṁkīrṇa* (conjunction of different figures) implying thereby that the figure is a new addition to the list which must have exhausted, with *saṁkīrṇa*[1] This peculiar position of the figure in Daṇḍin's scheme makes us to presume that it occupied in earlier tradition a unique place,[2] quite distinct both from the poetic excellences and figures, and that our author, due to his peculiar viewpoint, included it, like the *mārga guṇas* and *sandhyaṅgas* etc, in his pervasive conception of *alaṁkāra* According to the evidence of *Jayamaṅgalā*, Bhaṭṭi devotes a full canto (XII) to the illustration of the concept, though it is not known what he exactly means by the term

The conception of *bhāvika* in Daṇḍin has a scope wider than what a particular *guṇa* or *alaṁkāra* can possess, it involves multifarious elements of vast application It is really difficult, therefore, to assign it a place in a clear cut scheme either of the *guṇas* or of the *alaṁkāras* According to Daṇḍin it consists in (i) mutual assistance of all the parts or elements of the plot, (ii) avoidance of redundant attributes, (iii) the depiction of things in their proper place and (iv) so arranging the matter that the intended depth of theme comes out clearly (II 365 6) All these elements are controlled, as a whole, by *bhāva*, the intention or the inward conception of the poet that creates a poetic organism out of the materials that lack life in isolation and hence the name *bhāvika*[3] As S K De rightly observes, the *bhāva* here should be taken as an aesthetic element relating to the essential poetic con

1 Its enumeration after *saṁkīrṇa* may also imply that it is free from the grip both of *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* elements cp Hṛd on KA II 363

2 We cannot safely connect it as Raghavan (SCAS pp 118 9) proposes to do with Bharata's *bhāvita* the 12th *aṅga* of *bhāṇa* (IHS XX 152) given as *bhāvika* by Abhinavagupta and Śāradātanaya

3 Cp Krishna Chaitanya SP pp 196 7 Ratna (on KA II 364 366) explains *bhāva* as a poet's persevering endeavour leading to successful accomplishment of a composition It is acc to him the faculty of distinguishing good from bad which a poet must possess Ruyyaka (AS k 72 *vṛtti* p 203) interprets it as a poet's feelings or thoughts which are reflected in a reader's mind

ception of the poem itself so that the poem is viewed as a product of the poet's mind and not merely as a more or less external application of rhetorical precepts Thus *bhāvika*, according to him is 'all pervading characteristic of the poem as a whole which controls its subject matter as well as its expression, as a vivid externalisation of the poet s essential poetic idea It emphasises that aspect of poetry in general which is the expression of the poet s mind as an aesthetic fact, and which is the main problem of Western Aesthetic but is practically ignored elsewhere in Sanskrit Poetics' [1]

Although Bhāmaha, like Dandin, enumerates *bhāvika* among the poetic figures and also refers to it as a characteristic excellence applicable to a composition as a whole, his exposition of the concept is based entirely on a different ground According to him it consists in representing objects whether past or future as if they were present the condition of representation being that the theme must have picturesque exalted and striking meaning and the words used must be perspicuous [2] Despite its closeness to the *svabhāvokti* figure from which it became necessary to distinguish it in later times [3] Bhāmaha s *bhāvika*, like that of Daṇḍin emphasises the importance of subject matter lucid diction and charming expression and as such stands above the restricted scope of *guṇas* and *alaṃkaras* This conception of Bhamaha comes down in Udbhaṭa and through him in later writers like Mammata Viśvanātha and Appaya Dikṣita but in the long journey it loses the wide range it once commanded and is reduced to merely a narrow rhetorical figure consisting in so vivid a description of past or future that it appears to be

1 Cp SPSP pp 56-7 As De further remarks though earlier theorists were mainly concerned with external rhetorical elements they exhibit however vaguely their consciousness of the internal problem by admitting that the element which controls a composition as a whole is the poet s *bhāva*

2. BKAl III 53-4

3 Cp AS k 79 *vṛtti* p 206 SD X 93 f Keith (HSL pp 380-1) equates it with Aristotle s *energeia* Viśvanātha distinguishes it also from *prasāda guṇa* the sentiment of wonder and the figures *atiśayokti* and *bhrāntimat* Ruyyaka distinguishes it from *bhrānti atiśayokti utprekṣā kāvyaliṅga rasavat* and *prasāda guṇa* besides *svabhāvokti*

actually present[1] Some writers like Vāmana[2] and Rudraṭa totally ignore the concept while Bhoja develops a new conception apparently on the line of Daṇḍin s idea of poet's intention termed *bhava* and assigns it a place in his *guna* scheme and gives *rasavat* as its counterpart in *alamkāras*[3] But his exposition is, on the whole, vague aud far fetched

Although Daṇḍin s conception of *bhāvika* could not win popular recognition in later theory it must be admitted that his exposition is, comparatively speaking, more comprehensive and scientific

Besides the *alamkāras* discussed above, Daṇḍin refers to a few more figures He deals with them in the course of his treatment of other figures as their mere varieties, but it is evident from his own admission that they were regarded as independent figures by other theorists Such figures are *ananvaya* conceived as *asādhāranopamā*, *sasamdeha* as *samśayopama* and *upamārūpaka* described as a form of *rupaka*[4] He also mentions *utprekṣāvayava* as a variety of *utprekṣā*, though he does not deal with it in course of his treatment of the figure All these figures find a place in the works of Bhaṭṭi, Bhāmaha and Vāmana, though *Viṣnudharmottarapurāna* knows only *ananvaya* of them[5] Udbhaṭa refers to *ananvaya* and *sasamdeha* only, while Rudraṭa mentions only the latter one

Daṇḍin also deals with the phenomenon of the conjunction

---

1 Cp KASS VI 12 KPr X k 114 AS k 79 *vṛtti* SD X 93 Kuval I 161

2 We cannot hold with Sovani (*Bhand Com Vol* II p 399) that Vāmana analyses Daṇḍin s *bhāvika* into his ideal *gunas śleṣa* and *ojas* for the concepts bear just superficial resemblance

3 Cp SKA IV 86–7 and I 65 f 75 ŚPr IX Josyer ed II pp 343–4 also cp SKA, KM ed p 705 where Bhoja says that *bhāvika* when possessed of the quality of exaltedness becomes *rasavat* Ruyyaka s (AS k 79 *vṛtti* p 206) approach however is different when he remarks that *bhāvika* becomes *rasavat* when a reader heartily shares the poet s emotions.

4 Cp KA II 358 9 along with II 26 37 and 88

5 Cp BKAl III 35 43 45 47 KASV IV 3 11 14 32-3 The figure *ananvaya* may be traced back to Bharata s *sadṛśī* variety of *upamā* (BNS XVII 54)

of poetic figures, which he terms *samkīrna* (II 359) He divides it into two forms, namely interdependent combination of figures and their independent communion or equal co existence (II-360) In later theory these cases were recognised as *samkara* (commixture) and *samsrsti* (conjunction) respectively,[1] which terms our author employs indiscriminately in his work It may be remarked casually that a large number of sub species of Dandin s figures are the result of such combinations as is evident from the foregoing discussion of his individual figures

As has been said above Dandin comprehends, in his all absorbing conception of *alamkāra* the *samdhyangas* (forms of dramatic junctures) *vrttyangas* (forms of dramatic manners) and the *laksanas* (II 367) which elements in fact belong to the drama proper, as Bharata and later dramaturgists maintain The dramatic junctures are five in number, *viz* *mukha* (introduction) *pratimukha* (progression), *garbha* (development) *vimarsa* (pause) and *nirvahana* (conclusion), further sub divided into sixteen kinds in all[3] The dramatic manners (*vrttis*) are four namely *Kaisiki* (graceful) *Sāttvati* (grand) *Ārabhatī* (violent) and *Bharati* (verbal) each sub divided into four forms[4] The word *ādi* (*et cetera*) in the *Kāvyadarsa* (II 367) still widens the sphere of *alamkāra* which tends to include the *vithyangas* (forms of *vithi* drama like *udghatyaka* etc) and the *lasyāngas* (forms of *lasya* dance like *geyapada* etc) also What Dandin means to emphasise is that all elements of poetry and drama, in what ever capacity they might be come within the fold of the concept of *alamkāra*[5] which could otherwise hardly accommodate these elements The case of *lakṣanas* however, is different, for they can be well fitted into the *alamkara* scheme as Bharata himself

1 Cp KPr X k 139-42 AS k 84-5 *vrtti* also cp B S Vyasa Hindi Kuval pp 285-304 For the phenomenon also cp BKAI III 49 KASV IV 3 30-3 SD X 97-8 etc

2 KA II 367 also cp ASK p 2 v 11 (which mentions *anga lakṣana* and *vrtti* with reference to Bhāsa s plays)

3 Cp BNS XIX 37-67 DR I 22 ff SD VI 81-115 Also cp Keith SDr pp 298 300

4 BNS XX 1-73 DR II 44-57 III 5 SD VI 171-5 cp Keith SDr pp 326-8 V S Agrawal HSA pp 33-4

5 Cp also V Raghavan SCAS p 25

implies by calling them poetic embellishments (*kāvyavibhu sanas*)[1] Although Bharata nowhere distinguishes the two concepts it is evident that he develops them separately, giving more prominence to the *laksanas* Following his line Abhinavagupta deals with the concept of *laksana* in detail[3] He refers to ten different views with regard to it his own view being that the *lakṣanas* are more comprehensive than the *alamkāras* inasmuch as they are inseparably one with the body of poetry since they impart beauty to poetry by themselves and are not added, like *alamkāras* to it for extraneous embellishment Thus according to him *lakṣana* is the poetic expression itself put in tune with *rasa*, and as such it constitutes the poetic gift Again in his view, the *laksanas* beautify even the *alamkaras* by bestowing on them the intrinsic charm without which comparisons like *gavaya* (Gayal) is like a cow do not form simile

Abhinavagupta's elaboration of the concept could not win approval of the later writers who either summarily dismissed the *lakṣanas* or recognised their importance only in the sphere of drama Consequently in course of time, they almost disappeared from the arena of Poetics proper, being swallowed up by the *alamkāras* with which they coincided in function from the earliest period[4]

Many of the *lakṣanas* developed, as early as Daṇḍin s time, into poetic figures either in substance or in name or even in both Even if they survived as independent entities in some theorists their existence was superfluous and insignificant The *lakṣanas* appearing in Daṇḍin as poetic figures are *hetu samśaya-(upama)*, *nidarśana*, *atiśaya* *lesa* *asis* and *priyavacas* (*preyas*) Some *lakṣanas* like *dṛṣṭanta* *nirukta* and *arthāpatti* assumed the garb of figures in later theorists It may be added that the conception of most of the *lakṣanas* changed in course of

---

1 BNS XVII 1-39 cp esp XVII 42 Śiṅgabhupāla Śāradātanaya etc. call these *lakṣanas* by the name of *bhuṣana* cp also Keith SDr pp 329 30

2 Cp BNS XVII 16 ff It may be noted that Bharata knows only four figures but deals with thirty six *lakṣanas*

3 Cp AB esp pp 383 390

4 Also cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 12-4 De HSP II p 5

their migration, while some appear to have changed their names in the process Thus we may detect the spirit of the *lakṣanas*, *gunatipata, garhana, diṣṭa, prasiddhi* and *aksarasamghata* in the later figures, *vyājastuti, aprastutapraśamsa* (according to Daṇḍin's conception), *svabhavoktI, udatta* and *śleṣa* respectively Again, as Abhinavagupta points out, these *lakṣanas* have an indirect hand in the formation of a number of varieties of the figures which we notice in Sanskrit theorists and especially in earlier writers [1]

VERBAL FIGURES *(ŚABDĀLAMKĀRAS)*

Daṇḍin gives the verbal figures evidently a secondary place in his scheme, though he deals with them in great detail. His treatment is far more elaborate than that of Bhāmaha and a host of others who followed him

Among the verbal figures first comes *anuprāsa*[2] which he deals with under the *guna, mādhurya* as its verbal aspect It is a word sequence where there is a formal harmony that is felt with previous word or words (I 52) It corresponds to the later *śrutyanuprasa* consisting in the grouping of similar sounds in the form of letters belonging to the same place of articulation There is another form of *anuprāsa* which has been defined as repetition of similar letters bordering upon one another and retaining thereby the impression of previous alliterative sounds (I 55) This variety approximates to the later *chekānuprāsa* and *vṛttyanuprasa*[3] *Anuprasa* seems to have been evolved from the older figure *yamaka* In fact, the two figures are what Bharata would term *śabdabhyasa* (verbal repetition) in a wider sense *Yamaka* may be understood, within its range, as *padā bhyāsa*, the recurrence of words the other being the repetition

1 Cp AB pp 390 401 for a detailed study of *lakṣanas* see V Raghavan SCAS pp 1-44 also De HSP II pp 4-5 SPSA pp 22-3

2 The comm Vidyācakravartin on AS (k 4-5) explains the term as an excellent arrangement of letters (*prāsa*) in accordance with (*anu*) the *rasa* so as to embellish it cp S S Janaki AS intro pp 54 5

3 Cp KPr IX k 79 f SD X 4 In Bhāmaha (BKAl II 5) as in Daṇḍin it is simply *anuprāsa*

of syllables [1] Bhāmaha's treatment of *anuprāsa* is more elaborate than Daṇḍin's he divides it on the basis of the *vṛttis*, *lāṭi* and *grāmyā* which classification gets further elaboration and improvement in the works of Udbhaṭa Rudraṭa and others [2]

Yamaka consists in the peculiar repetition of a group of letters (I 61), which may take place either mediately or immediately or both ways (III 1) Again it may occur (i) in the beginning of a metrical line, (ii) in the middle (iii) at the end, (iv) in the beginning, middle and end, (v) in middle and end, (vi) in the beginning and middle, (vii) in the beginning and end or (viii) in the entire line [3] Still again the recurrence may cover one line or two or three or all the four lines Of the numerous varieties numbering more than 300, formed on these bases, Daṇḍin illustrates nearly forty forms (III 4 50) Besides he describes seven other varieties which he probably inherited from the tradition (III 51-77) These species are (i) *saṁdaṣṭa*, where the repetition occurs at the end of the first line and is followed up in second and third lines both in the beginning and at the end and lastly in the beginning of the fourth, thereby giving the verse the shape of a pair of tongs (*saṁdaṣṭa*) (ii) *samudga* repetition of a hemistich, (iii) *pādābhyāsa*, repetition of a full line, (iv) *ślokābhyāsa*, recurrence of a verse in the following one, (v) *mahāyamaka* consisting in the sameness of all the four lines which are, on their part possessed of the repetition of letters, (vi) *viḍātiya*, formed by combining the different forms and (vii) *pratilomayamaka*, repetition in reverse order [4]

Although Daṇḍin expressly strikes out the figure from the

---

1 Cp BNS XVII 62 ff Abhinavagupta comprehends *anuprāsa* within the scope of *yamaka*.

2. Cp BKAl II 5-8 KASS I 1-20 RKAl II 18-32 etc. For elaborate treatment cp SKA II 70 ff KPr and SD *loc cit* The main forms are *śruti-* *vṛtti-* *varṇa-* *pada-* *cheka-* and *antya-*

3 KA III 1-2. This basis of division may be traced back to Bharata (XVII 62) Bhāmaha (II 9-10) also refers to it

4 Of these forms *saṁdaṣṭa* finds a mention in Bhaṭṭi Bhāmaha Rudraṭa etc. and *samudga* in writers from Bharata onward *Mahāyamaka* is an improvement on Bharata's *caturvyavasita* (XVII 81-2) later adopted in Agni-P (343 11 ff) cp S D Gyani *Agni P A Study* pp 65-6 Mammaṭa's *mahāyamaka* is equal to Daṇḍin's *ślokābhyāsa*

sphere of his verbal *mādhurya* stamping it as not invariably conducive to sweetness (I 61), his attitude towards it appears to be strongly favourable What he probably means is that the figure does not constitute the *mādhurya guna*, though in its own sphere it occupies a kingly position as his elaborate treatment of the figure (III 1 77) shows His predilection for *yamaka* which he gives one of the fullest treatments in the whole realm of *Alamkara* literature '[1] is also indicated by the sustained labour he puts in composing its difficult illustrations

The history of *yamaka* is sufficiently old - Bharata describes it in detail illustrating its ten varieties[3] many of which survive, either in name or in substance in Bhaṭṭi, Dandin and others Most of the writers who came after Danḍin developed an apathetic attitude towards it[4] The figure did not visualise conceptual change throughout its long history though we notice a slight improvement in its exposition Bharata and Danḍin do not refer to the requisite difference of meaning in the repeated unit of words which characteristic element has been mentioned for the first time by Bhāmaha and has been scrupulously followed by later writers[5]

Among verbal figures Daṇḍin also deals with some *citrā lamkāras* (amazing figures or verbal feats) Of these, *gomūtrikā* (zigzagging) consists in the similarity of alternate letters of two hemistiches (III 78 9) The revolution of a verse in two directions is called *ardhabhrama* while that in all the directions is termed *sarvatobhadra*[6] The *svaraniyama sthāna-* and *varna-*

1 Cp De HSP II p 64
2 Cp Rām. Sundar 1 -17 Rudradāman s insc of 2nd cent A D c The tradition recorded in Rājaś khara s KMim. I (p 2) however that Citrāṅgada expounded the figure (cp above) is of dubious character
3 Cp BNS XVII 62 ff
4 Bhāmaha (II 9–17) gives only 5 varieties and Udbhaṭa altogether omits it Mammaṭa (KPr IX k 83 *vrtti*) calls it a *knot* in poetry like that in sugar-cane which hinders the realisation of *rasa* Vāmana (IV 1 1-7) Rudraṭa (RKAI III) Bhoja (SKA II 58-67) and the author of Agni P (343 11-20) however give it an elaborate treatment
5 Cp BKAI II 17 SKA II 58 ŚPr X Josyer ed. II pp 388 9 Agni P 343 11-2 KPr IX k 83 AS k 6 *vrtti* SD X 8 etc
6 KA III 80, also cp ASK p 100 (*sarvatobhadra* as a form of *duṣkara*

consist in the restricted use of vowels letters of particular *sthanas* (places of articulation of sounds) and syllables respectively (III 83 96) These forms involve verbal ingenuity of a high degree and have been rightly called *duṣkaramargas* (dictions hard to be accomplished) by the writer who, however successfully tries his hand on these literary feats in his works [1]

Another form of arduous verbal jugglery is the *prahelikā* (riddle or enigmatic speech) which has been elaborated at great length by the author [2] The riddles, according to him, serve useful purpose in literary clubs in secret consultations in public and in perplexing the minds of others (III 97) He gives its sixteen varieties stamped as good species by older *acāryas* as distinct from bad ones which number fourteen The sixteen varieties are (1) *samāgatā* where meaning is hidden by coalescence of words, (2) *vañcitā* where real meaning is lost in the apparent one, (3) *vyutkrantā* the use of semantically connected words at great distances (4) *pramusitā* obscure meaning, (5) *samānarupā*, conveyance of derivative meanings, (6) *paruṣā* conveyance of grammatical meanings (7) *samkhyatā*, conveyance of meaning by numerics (8) *prakalpitā* assumed meaning (9) *nāmāntaritā*, hidden names (10) *nibhṛta* hidden meanings (11) *samānaśabda* confusing use of synonyms (12) *sammuḍhā* vexing use of words (13) *parihārika*, avoidance of usual meaning (14) *ekacchannā* hidden *asraya* or container, (15) *ubhayacchannā* hidden container and contained and (16) *samkirnā* a combination of various forms (III 98–105)

The tradition of *citrabandhas* seems to be quite old though Bharata does not refer to them Bāṇa mentions them and Bhāravi and Māgha, as also Daṇḍin himself employ them in

kāvya)

1 KA III 83 96 186 also cp. ASK p 100 (*duṣkara-kāvya*) For his literary *tour de forces* see below pt III ch IV

2. KA III 96 124 he however does not define it Bhāmaha (II. 19) defines it as riddle of the *yamaka* class intricated by various roots and their senses. Dharmadāsa Sūri defines it as concealment of real meaning and conveyance of some other instead, finally resulting into an indication of both the meanings.

varying degrees[1] Bhāmaha tells us that some Rāmaśarman dealt with *prahelikās* in *Acyutottara*[2] (correct answer), and in later period, Dharmadāsa Suri (13th century) treats them exclusively in his *Vidagdhamukhamandana* With regard to the admissibility of these artificial feats in the sphere of poetry, there were two distinct opinions While some writers like Daṇḍin, Rudrata Bhoja and the author of *Agni Purāna* attach much importance to these forms, a good number of others show their indifference or aversion to this kind of artificial poetry[3]

AN ASSESSMENT OF DAṆḌIN S TREATMENT OF POETIC FIGURES

Daṇḍin being one of the earliest theorists, his treatment of poetic figures is important from the point of view of tracing the early history of their development in Sanskrit Poetics Of course it is comparatively immature for evident reasons Daṇḍin treats in all forty eight figures, thirty nine belonging to ideal embellishment and nine relating to verbal decoration He appears to have faithfully followed the traditional enumeration except with regard to the figures *anamaya* etc, and the fact explains his inclusion of figures such as *preyas* and *āsis* which, strictly speaking, cannot be termed as such

His exposition of some of the figures presents somewhat rudimentary stage The definitions of some of them suffer from the fallacy of definition—too wide (*ativyāptidoṣa*) due to which many figures appear to encroach upon the sphere of other *alamkaras* A special mention may be made of the figures

---

1 Cp Kād. (para 4) which refers to such literary feats as *akṣaracyutaka mātrā- bindumatī* and *gudhacaturthapāda* besides *prahelikā* also cp. ŚPr X Josyer ed II pp 356-7 also see Kir XV Śiś XIX etc.

2. BKAl II 19

3 Rudrata devotes a full ch (V) to these *citrabandhas* also cp SKA II 109-37 ŚPr X Josyer ed II p 387 KPr IX Agni P (343 22-65) etc. On the other hand Bhāmaha (II 19) makes a passing ref to one of the forms *prahelikā* Udbhata and Vāmana ignore them also cp DhA III 41 2 *vṛtti* (pp 525 ff) and esp SD X 13-4 which discredit these verbal jingles as causing hindrance in the enjoyment of *rasa* this attitude is first seen in Bhāmaha (II 20)

based on incongruity which though defined separately, overlap each other and specially tend to be drawn towards the conception of the main figure of the class, *viz* *virodha* It was perhaps for this reason that the later theorists felt the need of modifying the definitions of many of these figures and in some cases even of giving entirely a new exposition to them

Daṇḍin had not evolved a definite basis for the classification of figures The so called basis of the elements of *svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* cannot be held to be a logical one nor is it comprehensive enough to cover all the figures There is no specific demarcation of sphere of the two elements and it is often difficult to categorise the figures in a particular class Again, the author does not possess a logical scheme of the division of individual figures which in most cases have been divided and sub-divided quite arbitrarily into innumerable varieties The tendency has been followed to the extent of absurdity in the case of figures like *upamā*, *akṣepa* and *yamaka* There are in Daṇḍin some figures which have not been conceived precisely or at least explained properly Such figures are *anuprāsa*, *ākṣepa* *vyatireka* *hetu* *paryayokta* *viśeṣokti* and *nidarśana* Again, there are some figures such as *apahnuti* and *aprastuta praśamsā* which could not receive full justice from him

As regards the illustrations, they are generally expressive, but in some cases they represent either a narrower or a wider scope than what the definitions really afford Examples with too narrow a scope are in a way helpful in understanding the exact conception of the figure in case its definition is not so precise There are cases where the exact nature and scope of figures and specially their varieties are determined by illustrations alone the various forms of *akṣepa*, for instance are defined so to say, by their examples The illustrations which present a scope too wide for definitions result into the formation of a large number of new figures in later times Such new figures which may be traced back to Daṇḍin s examples are *adhika anumāna* *asamgati* *parisamkhyā* *pratīpa* *bhrantimat* *milita* *viṣama* *samādhi* *sama* *atyukti* (inspired from Daṇḍin s opposite form of the *guṇa* *samādhi*) *vīsesa* and *kārakadīpaka*

On the whole Daṇḍin s treatment of *alamkāras* gives an

impression that the doctrine is passing through a transitional stage with bright prospects ahead which we do visualise in later theorists His treatment of figures, with all its merits and defects affords above all, an important link between the doctrine in the making on one hand and its steady development on the other

The elaborate treatment he has given to the concept clearly implies that he regarded the *alamkāras* as the principal elements of poetry His reference to them in juxtaposition with the body of poetry (*kāvyaśarira*) in I 10 indicates that in his scheme they are intimately related to the latter as beautifying elements and his definition of the concept affirms the fact

Great credit goes to the writer for giving the concept a lucid and bright exposition by defining, as precisely as possible, the scope of various poetic figures along with their varieties and his claim[1] in this respect is justified to a considerable extent

1 Cp KA II 2 किं तु बीज विकल्पानां पूर्वाचार्यै प्रदर्शितम् । तदेव परि-संस्कर्तुमयमस्मत्परिश्रम ॥

CHAPTER VIII

DANDIN AND LATER DOCTRINES OF POETICS

Daṇḍin lived and worked in a period when various theories were making their appearance, whether conscious or subconscious in the horizon of Poetics. The theory of *dhvani* (suggestion) had not yet been evolved, though it may be observed in its crude form in Daṇḍin's reference to the idea of suggestion in his treatment of the figures *akṣepa* and *vyatireka*[1]. We have already discussed the concept of *vakrokti* as an element characterising poetic figures, which developed in later times into a full fledged system of Poetics. Other doctrines to which our author makes a passing reference or which we may observe in him in their rudimentary form are the theories of *rasa* and *aucitya* which occupied prominent place as definite systems of later Poetics. It is worthwhile to make a brief reference to these doctrines.

THE DOCTRINE OF *RASA*

Daṇḍin recognises the importance of *rasa* in poetry or in a

---

1. The element of suggestion is frequently noticed in Daṇḍin's examples of *ākṣepa* which was later approximated to the poetry of subordinate suggestion. One of his examples (KA II 139) has been cited as an instance of *vastudhvani* by Hemacandra (KAn pp 37-8); also cp above ch VII under *ākṣepa*. For the concept of suggestion implied in *vyatireka* cp KA II 182 and also II 180 189. The concept can also be traced in KA I 76 78 II 14 16 46 189 195 205 213 295 303; cp V Raghavan ŚPr p 139. The idea of secondary significance of words beyond the primary one which touches the concept of *dhvani* is traceable in Daṇḍin's *samādhi guṇa* (KA I 95). In KA II 254 also Daṇḍin speaks of *gauṇavṛtti*, secondary significance of words. Krishna Chaitanya (SP p 137) notices the idea of the suggestive power of words in KA I 65 6 where Daṇḍin remarks that some words—quite apart from their meanings—can have vulgar resonances due to quite accidental sexual puns.

mahākāvya which, according to him should be abounding in sentiments and emotions [1] Being however an *alamkāra* theorist, he assigns it a minor position in his system He deals with *rasas* under the figure *rasavat* where *rasa* as such is subservient to the expressed figure itself, of which it serves as a means of embellishment [2] Thus in him *rasa* is an ornamentation of language or of the sense His peculiarly objective view point with regard to the concept is evidently responsible for the subordinate place which he and other followers of *riti* and *alamkāra* schools accord to it [3]

Daṇḍin enumerates and illustrates the traditionally recognised eight *rasas* which are *sṛngāra* (erotic sentiment), *vira* (heroic sentiment), *karuṇya* (pathetic sentiment) *hāsya* (comic sentiment) and the sentiments of *raudra* (fury), *bibhatsa* (horror), *adbhuta* (wonder) and *bhayānaka* (terror) developed respectively from the dominant emotions (*sthāyibhāvas*) of *rati* (love), *utsāha* (energy) *soka* (pathos) *hāsa* (mirth) *krodha* (anger), *jugupsā* (disgust) *vismaya* (astonishment) and *bhaya* (fear) He also refers to the various elements which cause the realisation of *rasa* Besides the dominant emotions which he expressly mentions he implies the ideas of determinants (*vibhavas*) which may be either fundamental (*ālambana*) or excitant (*uddipana*) ones, consequents (*anubhavas*) and transitory emotions (*vyabhicaribhāvas*) in his term *rupabahulyayoga* As said above his conception of *rasa* was objective as that of Lollaṭa if we accept Abhinavagupta s interpretation of his view Daṇḍin, according to him, believes in causal development of sentiment through *vibhavas* and *anubhāvas* otherwise remaining dormant [4] From what the writer himself remarks in this connection it is gathered that the development of *rasa* in his view follows from some

---

1 KA I 18

2 Cp esp II 287

3 Vāmana (III 2.24) for instance includes *rasa* in his *guna kānti* cp De SPSP pp 182 5 Sovani *Bhand Com Vol* II pp 397-8

4 Cp AB on BNS VI KM ed p 62 (where he cites KA II 281 and 283 and remarks that acc to Daṇḍin the dominant emotions develop into corresponding sentiments through the assistance of *vibhāva* and *anubhāva* etc.)

dominant emotion [1]

It may be casually remarked that the term *rasa* used in the context of *mādhurya guna* does not denote *rasa* in its technical meaning of sentiment, as has been taken by some writers [2] The word there conveys quite a different sense The alliterative series of words and the refined meaning have been collectively regarded as elements conducive to *rasa* or elegance [3] Daṇḍin himself means to distinguish the two when he states that the *rasa* of *mādhurya guna* is a means of refined speech while the traditional *rasas* refer to eight emotions and their realisation as corresponding sentiments [4]

THE PRINCIPLE OF *AUCITYA*

According to Kṣemendra, the great exponent of the principle of *aucitya* in poetry that which suits or conforms to a particular thing is called *ucita* in its relation to that object [5] This idea of *ucita* or *aucitya* (propriety) may refer to various aspects of a poem such as the series of words the sense poetic excellences and figures, sentiments and language and diction It may also apply to considerations of time and place

Daṇḍin implies the idea of propriety in various spheres of his concepts and gives a general form of the doctrine in the making The principle of propriety is at work when he puts special stress on proper employment of words and condemns a speech improperly formed [6] The idea is again implied in his treatment of *gunas* and *doṣas* [7] and especially in his observation made perhaps for the first time in Sanskrit Poetics that defects

---

1 Cp KA II 281 283 and 285

2. E.g the comm. Taruṇa (on II 292) who calls it a ninth *rasa* and Bühler (cp Keith HSL p. 378) also K. C. Pandey *Comparative Aesthetics* vol I p 520 also see above pt I ch III pt II ch. IV

3 Also cp Ratna on KA I 52 62 and Hemacandra KAn. p 198 also cp above ch IV

4 KA II 292

5 Cp. AVC I 7

6. KA I 6 also cp above

7 It is important to note that Mahimabhaṭṭa (VV II) discusses the question of external propriety with ref to five defects of composition two of which *kramabheda* and *paunaruktya* correspond to Daṇḍin's *doṣas*

cease to be defects or even become excellences under certain circumstances [1] Again, the idea underlying *Kavikauśala* or the skill of a poet due to which all kinds of incongruities change into good qualities refers exactly to the sense of propriety said to be essential for a poet In course of his treatment of *upamādosas*, he makes an important observation that the cases of defective simile cease to remain faulty, if they do not hurt the cultivated sensibility they constitute defects only when they injure the mind of a *sahṛdaya* The writer further remarks that the faulty cases of simile are skilfully avoided by men of taste whose fine sensibility serves as the criterion for outlining merits and defects [2] This poetic sense of propriety clearly refers to the principle of *aucitya* in poetry Again the defect *deśakalaloka virodha* consisting in non observance of the rules of place, time and common usage [4] later developed by Kṣemendra as one of the spheres of application of the principle of *aucitya* underlines the doctrine in its inception Again Daṇḍin emphasises the importance of worldly usage which constitutes a vital aspect of the concept of propriety His *guna kanti* consists in non-violation of the common usage [5] while the ideal aspect of his *mādhurya guna* underlines the avoidance of indecency which in later theory appears as ideal or internal *aucitya* [6]

The idea of propriety is involved also in Daṇḍin s con

---

apakrama and *ekārtha* respectively

1 Cp above ch V After him the idea occurs in Bhāmaha (I 54-5) and in Rudraṭa (VI 8 21 4 29 39 47) who speaks of this as an aspect of propriety Bhoja (SKA I 89-156) develops this idea by forming a peculiar class of *gunas* called *vaiśeṣikas* see above also cp Raghavan SCAS pp 194 205

2. KA III 179 also cp III 130 133 137 141 146

3 Cp II 51 54–5 and esp 56 It may be noted that Kṣemendra (AVC I 8) includes gender and number also in his list of the cases to which the principle of *aucitya* is applied In KA II 56 the words कारण तत्र चिन्त्यताम् seem to allude to the sense of propriety also cp KA I 20

4 KA III 176 162-73

5 KA I 85 esp the ex I 87 illustrating so to say the *aucitya* of common usage which as Daṇḍin himself remarks here delights the hearts of men of taste who follow the worldly usage The ex I 91 exemplifies impropriety termed *ayukti* by Daṇḍin (I 92)

6 KA I 62 4 cp Mahimabhaṭṭa s *antaranga* or *arthaviṣaya aucitya*

ception of *bhavika* which brings about mutual assistance of different parts of the theme and helps the poet in avoiding redundant attributes and describing things in their proper place and in such a proper sequence of expression as clearly brings out even a serious theme [1] All these aspects of *bhavika*, which according to Daṇḍin are *bhāvāyatta* controlled by the inward conception of a poet that comprehends, *inter alia* his sense of propriety, refer to the various elements of *aucitya* Besides, the writer is eloquent on the point that the ultimate test of poetry rests with the appreciation of men of taste,[2] and thus by referring to the intrinsic sense of appreciation of the *sahṛdayas* or connoisseurs, he indirectly advocates the theory of *aucitya* in poetry

The doctrine of *aucitya* may be traced back to Bharata who as pointed out by V Raghavan implies the principle in his reference to worldly usage and dramatic manners and to the concepts of *prakṛti* and *pravṛtti* and in his treatment of acting and the ornamentation effecting it, of various qualities of recitation, of accents and the employment of sentiments and especially of the *anubhāvas* These elements point to the doctrine of appropriateness propriety and adaptation comprehended by the term *aucitya* [3]

The term *aucitya* however occurs as late as Rudraṭa who treats the concept with reference to the employment of poetic figures He also speaks of impropriety of usage, dress etc [4] After him the term occurs frequently in *Dhvanyāloka* in which Ānandavardhana deals with the concept with reference to poetic excellences and figures and above all, sentiments [5] His commentator, Abhinavagupta finely elaborates the idea according to him *aucitya* is understandable only with something else to which things are appropriate (*ucita*) for it is a relation and in

1 KA II 364 6 see above ch VII
2 I 20 51 71 83 II 51 53–4 56 etc
3 Cp BNS XIX XXIII 42 69 XXXI 111 9 XXIX 1-4 cp V Raghavan SCAS pp 194 ff
4 Cp RKAl II 32 XI 9
5 Cp III 6 7 8-10 14 *vṛtti* 19 33 etc

his view, it is *rasa* to which things should be in that relation [1] The principle of *aucitya* is also implied in Rājaśekhara's definition of *vyutpatti* [2] Kuntaka treats *aucitya* as a *guna*, while in *Agni Purana*, it comes as a poetic figure [3] Finally, Kṣemendra develops the idea of propriety into a systematic doctrine of *aucitya* which he extols as the soul of poetry overflowing with sentiments [4] He also speaks of *aucitya* as the essence of *rasa* and develops in this respect the idea of Ānandavardhana that impropriety is the only thing which disturbs the realisation of *rasa* and that the supreme secret of *rasa* consists in conforming to the rules of propriety [5] Thus the idea of *aucitya* was established as a definite system by Kṣemendra whom Mahimabhaṭṭa joined later

DAṆḌIN AND LATER THEORISTS

As we have seen in the foregoing pages, Daṇḍin covers a vast field of Sanskrit Poetics to which he richly contributes, and paves the way for his successors Almost all the theorists who come after him exhibit his great impact either direct or indirect, in their works [6] While dealing with the main streams of his poetic theory we have had sufficient occasion to refer to his influence on his successors Of his immediate followers Bhāmaha and Udbhaṭa belong to 8th century A D , the former flourishing in its first half and the latter in the second They develop the theory of *alamkara* on the line of Daṇḍin in their works which

---

1 Cp DhAL on above

2 KMIm V p 40

3 VJ I 53–4 for detail see Raghavan SCAS pp 194–213 230 ff

4 AVC I 5 औचित्य रससिद्धस्य स्थिर काव्यस्य जीवितम ।

5 *Ibid* I 3 cp DhA III 14 *vrtti* for a detailed account of the history of the concept *cp V Raghavan SCAS* pp *194–257 ŚPr pp 184 8 De* HSP II 232 283–5

6 Outside the Sanskrit literature Daṇḍin s work formed the basis of the *Kavirājamārga* of Nṛpatuṅga (815–75 A D) in Kannaḍa the anonymous *Daṇḍiyalaṅgāram* in Tamil and *Siya bas lakara* in Siṁhalese also cp K A Nilakanta Sastri HSI 1966 ed pp 345 381 393 see also pt I ch III It was translated in Bhoṭ by Rdor Rgyal in 13th cent also cp J S Tripathi OSKI pp 38–40

both of them name *Kāvyālaṃkāra*[1] Then follow Vāmana and Rudraṭa, both belonging to the second half of 9th century A D Of them, Vāmana in his *Kāvyālaṃkārasūtravṛtti* (written in *sūtra* and *vṛtti* style and divided into five *adhikaraṇas*) develops Daṇḍin s *mārga* theory in his own way and establishes the *rīti* school, while Rudraṭa[2] elaborates the older *alaṃkāra* theory in his *Kāvyālaṃkāra* (in sixteen chapters)

Then appear on the scene the *rasa dhvani* theorists who push back the earlier schools and propound the theory of suggestion of *rasa* They include the anonymous author of *Dhvani* and Ānandavardhana (last quarter of 9th century) the author of the *Dhvanyāloka* (in four *uddyotas*) as also his commentator, Abhinavagupta (c 980 1020 A D) who wrote the *Dhvanyālokalocana*, besides *Abhinavabhāratī*, a commentary on Bharata s *Nāṭyaśāstra* In later period, Mammaṭa and others followed the doctrine substantially

The writers who flourished between Ānandavardhana and Mammaṭa include Mukulabhaṭṭa (last quarter of 9th century), the author of *Abhidhāvṛttimātṛkā*, Rājaśekhara (c 900 A D), the author of *Kāvyamīmāṃsā* (in eighteen chapters), the unknown author of the *alaṃkāra* portion (chapters 337 47) of *Agni Purāṇa* (c 900 A D) Bhaṭṭa Tauta (third quarter of 10th century), the author of *Kāvyakautuka*, Bhaṭṭa Nāyaka (between 900 and 1000), the author of *Hṛdayadarpaṇa* Kuntaka (between 950 and 1050), the author of *Vakroktijīvita* (in four chapters) Mahimabhaṭṭa (end of 11th century) the author of *Vyaktiviveka* (in three chapters), Bhoja (between 1010 and 1055), the author of *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (in five chapters) and *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* (in thirty six chapters) and Kṣemendra (middle of 11th century), the author of *Aucityavicāracarcā* Among these writers, Kuntaka elaborates the theory of *vakrokti* the inspiration for which comes originally from Daṇḍin while Bhoja and the author of *Agni-Purāṇa* owe a great deal to him in respect of their general

---

1 Bhāmaha s work is divided into six chapters while that of Udbhaṭa (generally known as *Kāvyālaṃkārasārasaṃgraha*) contains about 100 verses in 6 *vargas* Udbhaṭa s other work *Bhāmaha-vivaraṇa* is lost

2. He is doubtfully identified with Rudrabhaṭṭa the writer of *Śṛṅgāratilaka* cp for the discussion Satya Deva Chowdhury RKAI Intro pp 34-8

doctrines and of matter [1] The seed of Kṣemendra's *aucitya* was also sown by our author

Mammaṭa (c 1100) presents in consolidated form the earlier theories in his *Kāvyaprakāśa* (in ten chapters), though he chiefly patronises the doctrine of *rasa dhvani* His successors revive the *alamkāra* theory once again Among them, Ruyyaka (c 1150 A D) the author of *Alamkarasarvasva*, *Sahityamimamsā* etc, Vāgbhata I (first half of 12th century), the author of *Vāgbhaṭalamkāra* (in five chapters) Jayadeva (c 1200 50), the author of *Candrāloka* (in ten *mayūkhas*) and Vāgbhaṭa II (14th century), the author of *Kavyanusasana* (in five chapters), deserve special mention Some writers cover, like Mammaṭa, the entire field of Poetics, their list includes Hemacandra (1080 1173 A D) the author of *Kavyanuśāsana* (in eight chapters), Vidyādhara (between 1285-1325) the author of *Ekavali* (in eight chapters), Vidyānātha (14th century), the author of *Prataparudrayaśobhuṣana* (in nine chapters) and, above all Viśvanātha (between 1300 1384), the author of *Sahityadarpana* (in ten chapters) Viśvanātha was followed by less familiar theorists such as Śaradatanaya (1175 1250) the author of *Bhāvaprakaśana*, Śingabhūpāla (c 1330) the author of *Rasarnavasudhakara*, Bhānudatta (between 1450 and 1500) the author of *Rasamañjari* etc, Rūpagosvāmin (c 1500 A D), the author of *Ujjvalanilamani* and Appaya Dikṣita (between 1554 and 1626), the author of *Kuvalayānanda* (written chiefly on the basis of Jayadeva's *Candraloka*) and *Citramimamsā*, till another big name appears in Jagannātha (1620 65) the author of *Rasagangādhara* (incomplete with only two chapters extant) who may be regarded as the last great writer of Sanskrit Poetics

A brief reference to the commentators of Daṇḍin may not be out of place here There are at least fifteen commentaries on *Kāvyadarśa* the oldest of them being perhaps the *Hṛdayam*

---

1 Bhoja in SKA takes as many as 205 verses from KA in ŚPr also he draws profusely from KA Agni-P takes at least 160 passages from KA For the Purāṇa s indebtedness to KA also cp S D Gyani *Agni P A Study* pp 44-101 On Bhoja s conception of *alamkāra* and his indebtedness to Daṇḍin cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 352-407 678-9

gamā by an anonymous author who wrote before Bhoja,[1] or the *Ratnaśrī* by Ratnaśrījñāna, a Ceylonese monk of about 900 A D Of others, those of Taruṇavācaspati (13th century), his son Keśavabhaṭṭāraka Harinātha (who wrote *Mārjanā*) (between 1575 and 1675) Vādijanghāla (who wrote *Śrutānupālinī*) and Mallinātha (the author of *Vaimalyavidhāyinī*) occupy next place both in point of time and value Among other commentaries are the *Daṇḍyarthamuktāvalī* by Narasiṃha Sūri, *Candrikā* by Triśaraṇalatabhīma *Vṛtti* by Kṛṣṇakiṃkara Tarkavāgīśa, *Rasikarañjanī* by Viśvanātha and those written by Bhagiratha, Yāmuneya, Vijayānanda (1626 A D) and Tribhuvanacandra Vādisiṃha, the last two being in incomplete form Besides, there are commentaries by anonymous authors Unfortunately, most of the commentaries are still in manuscript form Among modern commentators of Daṇḍin, the names of Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa, Jīvānanda Vidyāsāgara and Rāmacandra Miśra deserve special mention [2]

---

1 But acc to V Raghavan (ŚPr pp 678 9 the Hṛd. (on KA II 284 91) borrows from Bhoja's SKA (KM ed 1925) p 512, and therefore is later than Bhoja (1010–55 A D)

2 Cp for detail De HSP I pp 70–72 Kane HSP p 414 also cp Bibliog

CHAPTER IX

ACHIEVEMENTS OF DANDIN AS A RHETORICIAN

In the foregoing pages we have made an analysis and critical appraisal of the poetical doctrines of Daṇḍin, and it should be convenient now to see at a glance his outstanding achievements as a rhetorician Since the writer belongs to the formative period *of the history of Sanskrit Poetics*, it is too much to expect in his work the doctrines to be in their final or in some cases even in a developing form which we may observe in the works of Ānandavardhana Mammata, Viśvanātha and Jagannātha For understanding however the beginnings and early development of the poetical doctrines in their true perspective and for their correct appraisal a critical study of Daṇḍin's *Kavyadarsa* is most essential Daṇḍin comes in the field of Sanskrit Poetics when it had already crossed its first stage of early development and was about to enter the second—adolescent—stage Daṇḍin in fact facilitated its smooth entry into the new stage It was a creative period for the science with some doctrines advancing towards maturity and some others following them for winning recognition The concept of soul in the sphere of poetry had not yet come into being, poetry was judged objectively from the standpoint of external adornment which contributed to the aesthetic delight The question as to what constitutes the real poetic charm had not yet raised its head the early theorists concerned themselves only with the body of poetry as distinct from its soul Daṇḍin however, anticipated though indirectly, the theory of soul in poetry (which made its first appearance in Vāmana who declared *rīti* as the soul of poetry) when he said that the ten poetic excellences form the essence of the Vaidarbha *marga* which he extolled as the standard refined diction

We cannot say which of the two concepts, *mārga* and

alaṃkāra that Daṇḍin has expounded in great detail would have been given the status of the soul of poetry by him, had the question confronted him for he puts, both in theory and practice, equal stress on both of them Some scholars feel inclined to associate him chiefly with the *mārga* school on the plea that he laid marked emphasis on the *marga* and on its constituent excellences to which the *alaṃkara* school was indifferent [1] But, despite the marked emphasis that Daṇḍin puts on *mārga*, it should be remembered that he is a vehement advocate of the *alaṃkāras* in poetry, which embellish the poetic speech His conception of *alaṃkāra* is far wider than that of his *guṇas* constituting his *mārga*, which he conceives within the purview of his *alaṃkaras* The exhaustive treatment that he gives to the *alaṃkāras* should also confirm the view that his inclination towards the *alaṃkāra* school was, at least, as marked as it was towards the *rīti* theory He should be regarded therefore, as a propounder of the *alaṃkara* theory with the same force with which he is associated with the *rīti* school As a matter of fact, he affiliates himself to both the schools with equal zeal and would certainly resist his exclusive association with either of the two One of the reasons why he is denied as prominent a place in the *alaṃkāra* system said to have been patronised by Bhāmaha as in the *rīti* school is his supposed opposition to the views of the latter but even if we admit for argument's sake that Daṇḍin attacks Bhāmaha the opposite views held by them do not refer at all to the basic principle of *alaṃkara*, but they all appertain to the superficial details with regard to admissibility of certain poetic figures as such or to questions not connected with the *alaṃkāra* theory

As a great exponent of the *marga* doctrine or rather of the theory of the Vaidarbha diction Daṇḍin placed the system on a definite footing Although he did not define *marga*, he gave it a fine exposition and elucidated the dictions on the basis of the ten excellences which he inherited from Bharata He pioneered the relationship of the *guṇas* with the *mārgas*, which continued throughout the history of Sanskrit Poetics on some

1 Cp S. K. De HSP II p 78

form or the other His demarcation of the two *mārgas* is subtle and yet very clear, he gives practical illustrations to show how the same content may be expressed differently by the followers of the two *margas* But perhaps the most remarkable contribution of Daṇḍin to this theory is his anticipation of the distinction between diction and style in his observation that the dictions are infinite as exhibited in their writings by individual poets (*pratikavisthitah*), and that their differences are as subtle as those between various kinds of sweetness represented by sugarcane, milk and treacle etc It is the recognition of the subjective element in diction which makes it approximate closely to the concept of style as understood today

His treatment of *gunas*, however, is not precise There is vagueness in the conception of some of the excellences, though in some cases, he has improved upon the exposition given to them by Bharata Some of his *gunas* have not been clearly distinguished from each other, while some even tend to enter the arena of certain poetic figures Again, one of them the ideal *madhurya* does not represent a positive aspect which it is supposed to do, while no attempt has been made to classify the *gunas* into those of word and sense to which they implicitly refer In fact, the treatment of *gunas* presents a weak point of Sanskrit Poetics in general and the early theorists including Daṇḍin in particular

Daṇḍin s treatment of the defects on the other hand, is most commendable Though he did not define the concept nor did he indicate whether the *doṣas* represent a positive or negative character, it is clear from his analysis that they are in the main of positive nature, and that, according to him anything that is inappropriate in a certain context or condition and for that reason injures our poetic sensibility constitutes a defect with reference to that context or condition There is indirect admission here of some kind of subjective element in the concept, which was developed to its fuller possibilities by the later theorists His treatment of the subject heralds also the theory of *aucitya* later developed and finely elaborated by Kṣemendra Although Daṇḍin took the list of the *doṣas* from Bharata with a few variations either in name or in substance, he dealt with

them with scientific approach putting stress on their avoidance in poetry and particularly on their being of transient nature A defect according to him, is circumstanced by the context, and we cannot, therefore, define any feature in poetry as a flaw in all the cases of its occurrence Daṇḍin perhaps for the first time in the history of Sanskrit Poetics approaches the problem with scientific acumen, and analyses the defects from the functional point of view, and this must be regarded as one of his most significant contributions to the science of poetry in general and to the concept of *doṣa* in particular

Daṇḍin's treatment of the *alamkāras* implies that he considered the concept as the principal element of poetry though he has not explicitly described it as such His mention of the *alamkāra* alongside the body of poetry signifies that it is intimately related to the latter as an element beautifying it and his definition of the concept confirms this fact His important contribution to the theory is that he gave it a systematic exposition and made a specific attempt to define with as much precision as possible the scope of various poetic figures along with their varieties and his claim in this respect[1] is to a great extent justified Another special feature of his analysis of the concept is that he widened its scope so as to include within its fold all the elements such as *guṇas* and *lakṣaṇas* which added in any way to the charm of poetry And even the *rasas* were brought in as an aspect of *alamkara* in the form of the figure *rasavat* Although Daṇḍin does not classify the figures into those referring to verbal and ideal embellishment he implies the division in his separate treatment of the two classes To the verbal figures and especially to *yamaka, citralamkāras* and riddles he gives one of the most exhaustive treatments in the Sanskrit Poetics His significant achievement with regard to the poetic figures of sense is that he discusses perhaps for the first time their characteristic elements and in this respect elaborates the concepts of *atiśayokti śleṣa aupamya svabhāvokti* and *vakrokti* the last of which appears as a full fledged system in Kuntaka The seed of the later *dhvani* also was sown by Daṇḍin whose

1 KA II 2

conception of certain figures implies the idea of suggestion in the making Through the concept of *svabhāvokti*, Daṇḍin emphasised the quality of the evocation or the poetic natural ness which insists on the luminously perfect revelation of the context or meaning in poetry The concept of *bhāvika* forms another special feature of his treatment of poetic figures Through this peculiar *alamkāra guna* of application much wider than that of *alamkāra* and *guna*, he emphasises for the first time in definite terms that aspect of Sanskrit Poetics namely the aesthetic sense, which otherwise gets the least representation in it It refers to the inward conception of a poet which controls the details and resides in a poem as a whole and creates a poetic organism out of the materials that lack life in isolation

As regards the exposition of individual figures, Daṇḍin has succeeded in finely defining most of them, though some of his figures have been conceived vaguely with the result that there is no clear demarcation between their respective scopes The tendency to divide and sub divide a figure into numerous varieties often carried to the extreme as in case of *upamā rupaka* and *yamaka* has also in some cases adversely affected his elucidation of some of the figures With regard to the illustrations of the figures it may be said that they are generally expressive but in some cases they represent either a narrower or a wider application than what the definitions really afford It is interesting to note that these illustrations most of which are evidently his own creation reveal Daṇḍin s poetic art in its finer form and it is no surprising that a large number of them have been adopted by later theorists and especially by Bhojadeva and the author of *Agni Purāna* and have also been included in the old anthologies

It is said that Daṇḍin gave undue importance to the learning and practice as requisites of a poet and thereby indirectly admitted the dispensability of *pratibha* or poetic imagination for one aspiring for poetry It must be remembered however, that Daṇḍin does not admit the possibility of poetry in the total absence of *pratibhā* but only concedes that if one even though deficient in creative faculty 'propitiates Sarasvatī'

with vast learning and constant practice, he can be 'graced by the goddess with poetry, of course of lesser quality

There is no rigidity in Daṇḍin s approach he commands an open mind with liberal but scientific outlook We may observe his scientific approach to things in his comprehensive definition of *mahakavya*, his lucid exposition of *gunas*, *dosas* and *alamkaras* and, above all in his disapproval of the rigid distinctions made between *katha* and *akhyayika*

Thus we see that Daṇḍin made a rich contribution to the study of Poetics by giving scientific interpretation and analysis to the concepts that he inherited from earlier tradition making his own assessment of them and by presenting at places his own ideas, in a precise manner and in the most convincing way He made a profound impact on his successors many of whom refer to him with reverence as an old *ācarya* Some of his followers and especially Bhoja and the author of *Agni Purāna* quote profusely from him Outside the Sanskrit Poetics, too Daṇḍin influenced the works of a large number of writers in the field Of Daṇḍin s contribution to the early development of Sanskrit Poetics, the following assessment made by S K De may conveniently be quoted here ' Daṇḍin s work attempts to present many new ideas Possessing great inventive powers and gift of lucid exposition as well as a notable degree of scholastic acumen, he endeavoured not only to refute and correct in many places the earlier views but sometimes gave a new shape to them '[1]

1 HSP II p 86

PART III

DANDIN AS A WRITER OF PROSE *KĀVYA*

Daṇḍin is famed as one of the trio in the field of Sanskrit prose *kāvya*, the other two being Subandhu and Bāna, his great predecessors Chronologically following the brightest luminaries of the classical literature — the great classicists of the Golden Age of Indian History he inherits the glorious traditions of Sanskrit *kāvya* which he on his part enriches profusely with his contribution in the form of giving it a new genre in his *Daśa-kumaracarita* and excellently representing the literary aspirations of the age in his later romance, *Avantisundarīkathā*

The two romances representing as they do the two different stages of development of the art and style of the great writer, the first echoing his youthful spirit with natural emphasis on beauty, love wonder and romance and the second reeflecting his comparatively sober and serious mood give full expression to the poet s personality and mind and art In the following chapters, we shall trace in brief the origin of prose and early development of prose *kavya* and refer to the literary environ ments, characteristics and achievements of the age of Daṇḍin and in the light thereof we shall make a critical ass~ssment of the prose romances of the writer with reference to his art and style in them

CHAPTER I

ORIGIN OF PROSE AND PRE-DANDIN DEVELOPMENT OF PROSE *KĀVYA*

Prose as compared with verse occupies a lesser place in Sanskrit literature The evident reason for inclination towards verse and the consequent neglect of prose in Sanskrit is the fact that writings in verse are easily reduced to memory The medium of metrical measure makes a composition musical and concise, so that it soon gets inscribed on the canvas of a reader's mind This is one of the chief reasons why, not only the poetical compositions, but even the scientific works have been composed in verse in Sanskrit

Nevertheless prose existed and developed, however very slowly side by side with verse almost from the very beginning We cannot however, uphold the theory of Oldenberg[1] that prose intermingled with verses was the original form of literature in India According to the theory, this kind of literature existed in the *Ṛgveda*, the Brāhmanas the Epics and in the Jatakas It is said that while verses were preserved in definite form in these writings, the prose portion which was to be supplied by the story tellers was subsequently eliminated and according to Oldenberg the *Jatakamālā* and *Pañcatantra* are among the earliest extant examples of this form But the earliest form of prose with verses interspersed appears to be that where a gnomic verse is cited to corroborate what is stated in prose and this is in line with the practice followed in the Brahmanas and Dharmasūtras and in some cases in the Upaniṣads[2] The next

1 ZDMG XXXVII 54 ff XXXIX 52 ff GGA (1909) pp 66 ff cp Keith JRAS (1911) pp 981 ff (1912) pp 429 ff HSL pp 69 ff SDr pp 21-2 for the refutation of the theory

2 For a history of development of this form cp C N Tripathi CAAA pp 57, 100

stage is the class of composition where the writer concludes his treatment of a subject with a few verses of his own giving a resume of the theme Even the grammarians recognised the importance of this device[1] which was emulated by the writers like Kauṭilya and Vatsyāyana also in their works

The first appearance of prose we notice as early as the Vedic *saṁhitās*, and the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*, which is said to owe its qualification (*black*) to the fact that it is *blackened* (mixed) with prose, presents to us the oldest available specimen of prose In other schools, too, of the *Yajurveda* viz, in *Kaṭhaka*, *Maitrayani* etc, prose occurs in amplitude A mention may be made of the *Atharvaveda* also the sixth *kāṇḍa* of which is composed in prose Again, the Brāhmaṇas are mostly written in prose, they contain, *inter alia*, *ākhyānas* or traditional stories also which may be regarded as the rudimentary form of fiction in prose The prose form is found also in the Āraṇyakas and older Upaniṣads The *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and *Chāndogyopaniṣad* which are the oldest works of this class of Vedic literature are mostly in prose The Vedanga literature also is almost entirely written in what is called the *sutra* (aphoristic) style of prose which we observe in works like *Chandaḥ sutra* of Piṅgala and *Aṣṭādhyāyī* of Pāṇini

The Vedic prose which is freely and extensively used in literature is simple straight and forceful, it is unlike the classical prose composed of short sentences, devoid of lengthy compounds and laboured diction Poetic figures like simile and metaphor have been suitably employed with proper judgement and power The developed form of prose in the *Yajurveda* presupposes an earlier tradition perhaps of centuries and the conjecture is not wholly discardable that it existed in the Rgvedic period also though, of course we cannot maintain the existence of prose in the supposed original dialogic hymns of the *Ṛgveda*[2]

In the classical period we have glimpses of prose in various branches of learning namely, scientific, Purānic,

---

1 Cp the *kārikās* of MBhāṣ

2. Oldenberg (*loc cit*) advanced this hypothesis which has been amply confuted by Keith

inscriptional, dramatic and didactic literature, besides the prose *kāvya* literature proper Prose has been abundantly employed in scientific writings ranging from works on Grammar, Prosody, Philosophy Political Science and Economics to treatises on Medicine and Surgery From the point of view of style, it may be divided into the following classes (i) aphoristic (*sutra*) style (ii) commentatorial (*vṛtti*) style and (iii) expositive (*bhāṣya*) style For evident reasons, a proper development of prose norm could not be possible in these forms (and especially in the first one), though we often notice in them forceful prose composed in a style capable of fully expressing the requisite thought-material Patañjali s prose which is possessed of elegant and forceful diction deserves special mention in this respect

The prose found in the *Bhāgavata*- and *Viṣṇu Puranas* is still more charming and effective, though very little in quantity, it is amply ornamented, and the grace of literary prose is present herein in its moderate form But it is the inscriptional prose which closely approaches in point both of language and style to the literary prose It must have been influenced by the contemporary prose *kāvyas* which are now unfortunately lost, for it contains almost all the elements of poetic prose, *viz*, compactness, perspicuity, grace and embellishment The oldest available specimen of this ornate prose in the Girnar inscription of Rudradaman (150 A D) reminds us of Bāṇa s elaborate style though in point of time the two are separated by a period of about five centuries The inscription makes an express mention of "perspicuous, light pleasant varied charming and embellished prose elevated by verbal conventions and it is itself a befitting example of such ornate prose[2] The Allahabad inscription of Samudragupta (c 350 A D) by Hariṣeṇa presents another beautiful specimen of ornamented prose There are other epigraphs also which contain the elements of refined prose[3]

---

1 For the language of MBhā; cp P D Agnihotri PKB pp 37–43

2 EI VIII pp 36 ff for the *kāvya* features of this and other inscriptions cp Bühler s *Die Indischen Inschriften*

3 Cp for inscriptional records Fleet CII III D C. Sircar SI R B Pandeya *Historical and Literary Inscriptions*

The prose in dramas and especially in early plays is simple and direct and hence forceful It exhibits a style which is con cise but effective and polished but unostentatious The general poetic elements such as poetic figures and excellences have of course, been employed here, but with utter restraint Equally simple and straight is the prose found in the beast fables re presented by the *Pañcatantra* or its older recensions and later offshoots It avoids the employment of ornamental measures, though it possesses a peculiar charm of style of its own which is born of fluency, force and perspicuity Although the stories of *Pañcatantra* have been termed *kathas* and the word *ākhyāyika* is suffixed to its older recension, the work is never included in the category of ornate prose *kavya* for its evident indifference to embellished diction, as also for its being didactic in nature and spirit The prose style of *Jātaka* stories on the other hand professes to be artistic and ornate, and it may easily be accorded a suitable place between the prose diction of fable literature and that of the prose *kāvyas*

The literary prose form includes the prose *kavya* with its varieties like *katha* and *akhyayika*[1] as also the form *campu* where prose is interwoven with verses here and there The prose *kāvya* style which we observe in the works of Subandhu, Bāna and Danḍin presents a somewhat mature form and it is evident, therefore that it originated and received its early development much before these writers There is however no work extant belonging to this formative period and hence we cannot fully appreciate the merits and defects of the existing prose *kāvya* literature The existence of such prose works, however, is attested to by stray references in literature to the writings of this class and it may be traced back to at least 4th or 5th century B C Kātyāyana (300 B C) commenting on Pānini refers separately to *akhyāna* and *akhyāyika*[2] A little later, Patañjali (150 B C)

1 For other varieties like *khandakathā* etc cp above pt II ch II
2. Cp his *vārttika* on Pāṇ IV 2 60 and also on IV 3 87 The word *ākhyāna* in the sense of a story (of kings or other great men) is as old as Vedic times refs to it are in the Brāhmaṇas (Ait Br VI 18 10 ŚBr XIII 4 3 2) and it is possible that a definite corpus of *ākhyāna* lit existed in the Vedic times For the word also cp Rām. I 5 3, MBhār

commenting on the same mentions *Vāsavadattā*, *Priyaṃgama* and *Yayāti* as instances of *ākhyāna* and *Vāsavadattā*, *Sumanottarā* and *Bhaimarathī* as those of *ākhyāyikā* [1] Unfortunately, we do not know anything about these works Again we know nothing of *Cārumati* of Vararuci from which a stanza has been cited in Bhoja s *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* of *Śudrakakatha* perhaps a *kathā* by Rāmila and Somila referred to by Jahlana and Bhoja or of *Taraṅgavatī* of Śrīpālita praised in Dhanapāla s *Tilakamañjarī* and in Abhinanda's *Rāmacarita* as a contemporary of Hāla Sātavāhana (78 A D) [2] The works *Śatakarṇiharaṇa* and *Namovantikathā* written at the time of the Āndhrabhṛtyas are also mere names to us [3] as also the *Manovatī* referred to by Daṇḍin and Bhoja and *Sātakiharaṇa* mentioned by the latter [4] Bāṇa refers to Bhaṭṭāra Haricandra as the author of a prose *kāvya* of excellent merit [5] The writer has also been mentioned, along with Kālidāsa Subandhu and Bāṇa by the Prakrit poet Vākpatirāja (9th century A D) [6] Again we do not know anything about *Mādhavikā* (an *ākhyāyikā*), *Anaṅgavatī* (a *manthalikā*) *Matsyahasita* (a *manikulyā*) *Līlāvatī* (a *katha*), *Indumati* (a *khaṇḍakathā*) and *Citralekhā* (an *upakatha*), referred to in Bhoja s *Śṛṅgāraprakasa* [7] and about Rudra s *Trailokyasundarī* mentioned by Dhanapāla and Vardhamāna [8] Although in the absence of these works, we cannot see the origin and the course of early development of this important branch of Sanskrit

---

Vana 44 8 55 9 etc Nir XI 25 Also cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 613–4 The word *ākhyāyikā* in Taitt Ār I 6 3 has the general sense of an illustrative narration

1 Cp MBhāṣ IV 3 87 also cp KāS (c 650 A D)

2. Cp De HSL pp 200–1 also Sūkt IV 49 Tilak intro v 23 ŚPr XI Josyer ed II p 474 (mentioning *Śudrakakathā* by Pañcaśikha) XXVIII (vol IV p 479 of the Madras MS) (mentioning *Cārumatī* and citing a stanza therefrom) also cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 814–5 819–21

3 Cp ŚPr Madras MS IV p 481 for the first work also cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 827 8

4 ASK intro v 21 ŚPr XXVIII

5 Hear intro v 12

6. *Gauḍavaho* v 800 Rājaśekhara (KMīm X p 143) also refers to him

7 Cp XI Josyer ed II p 469 for these works cp V Raghavan ŚPr pp 813 21

8 Tilak intro v 35 Vardhamāna s *Gaṇaratnamahodadhi* v 64 vṛtti

literature in its true perspective, the above references prove beyond doubt the antiquity of this literary form which must have gradually evolved during a considerable period of time The earliest forms of prose *kāvya*, according to the evidence of rhetoricians, are those which were noticed and discussed by Daṇḍin and Bhāmaha They were however certainly not the works of Subandhu and Bana but some earlier prose *kāvyas* now lost to us From Daṇḍin s discussion of the subject, it appears that he had a good number of examples of various kinds of prose composition before him He recognises the broad division of prose *kāvya* into *kathā* and *akhyayikā* though he is against drawing a line of distinction between the two norms The older form of prose *kavya* reflected in these early theorists seems to have been replaced by the newer one evident ly on the line of the model set by Bana in his two romances, the chief characteristics of which were generalised into definite rules to be universally followed These specific rules on their part, finally stereotyped the two forms of prose *kāvya* in Sanskrit literature

In the absence of older material, it is difficult to determine the precise conception and original character of this form of literature though it is certain that it had no affinity whatsoever with the beast fable literature from which it is basically different in matter and spirit as also in technique Its early connection with folk tale literature however, may plausibly be presumed as is suggested not only by the designation *kathā* applied to the *Bṛhatkathā* which is again expressly referred to as a *katha* by Daṇḍin [1] but also by the fact that all the great prose writers, Subandhu, Bana and Dandin drew upon or at least received inspiration from, *Bṛhatkatha* the great storehouse of popular tales It must be clearly understood however that despite the close affinity in point of content and spirit there is essential difference between the two in conception and expression For obvious reasons the popular tale did not aspire for the artistic polish and finish which the prose *kāvya* stood for from its very inception and therefore the latter cannot be traced back to

1 KA I 38 the work is also referred to in ASK p 20

the former in point of diction and style for which its direct precursor is the ornate *kāvya* itself Thus the prose *kāvya* was evolved out of the artistic *kāvya* with the raw material either of the folk tale or some historical story

We need not discuss the suggestion that the *kāvya* style was first applied to historical story and then passed on to the popular tale which in later theory developed respectively into *ākhyāyikā* and *kathā*,[1] since it has no bearing on the basic problem of the origin of prose *kāvya* What is important to note is that *the raw material* was embellished and elaborated after the manner of the *kāvya* which subsequently also influenced the style and diction of its counterpart in prose The raw material in itself, whether it is folk tale or some historical story, cannot be allowed to enter the arena of poetry unless it is gracefully decorated and adorned

The conjecture that the original inspiration for the application of *kāvya* style to prose came from inscriptional panegyrics[2] is not tenable, for it is difficult to believe that the writers of *belles lettres* received impetus from the professional eulogists who, on the other hand appear to have emulated the *kāvya* writings Besides as we have seen above the origin of prose *kāvya* certainly belongs to a period much earlier than the extant inscriptions composed in ornate *kāvya* style

The foregoing discussion makes it clear that the prose *kāvya* in Sanskrit had a peculiar origin While on one hand, it handled the narrative material of popular tale with its natural and supernatural incidents and motifs and adopted its curious method of emboxing tales within tales along with certain other elements or if it happened to get some historical theme enlivened it with charming devices of folk tale it derived on the other its form and manner of story telling from the ornate *kāvya* the elements of which it developed or rather over developed The special stress laid on elaborate description and fine embellishment and the consequent neglect of theme bespeak of the great influence the *kāvya* exercised on it and therefore the

---

1 Keith CSL p 59 also cp De HSL p 205
2 Cp Keith HSL p 300

works of this norm may suitably be designated as prose *kāvyas* or poetical compositions in prose [1] The process of development of this type of prose composition was facilitated by the prevalent conception of *kavya* as any literary composition with poetical manner of expression whether it is in verse or prose Verse as a medium of exoression naturally predominated over prose which, on its part, fell a willing prey to the niceties of verse and zealously derived its rhythm and refinement The natural result was that like poetry it was often overelaborated and overembellished

Here we may discuss the question whether the Sanskrit prose *kāvya* exhibits any foreign influence either in its origin or during the long course of its development Peterson tried to prove Greek influence on the prose romances of Sanskrit on the basis that they exhibit a new spirit in richly embellishing the simple narrative dealing with swift but monotonous chain of adventures [2] He quoted in support of his view some characteristics common to the Sanskrit and Greek romances We do observe certain common features both, for example, depict (i) ideal love and wondrous beauty as also charming objects of nature (ii) love at first sight (iii) lovers revealed to each other in vision (iv) affectionate letters of courtship (v) pathetic lamentations of afflicted lovers, (vi) fighting for forceful possession of a maiden (vii) passion of love in inanimate objects, (viii) fickleness of fortune and (ix) adventures and encounters on land and at sea Again there are in both the romances the device of tales within tales erudite and often obscure allusions and enumeration of precedents and the employment of long compounds alliterations and figures like paronomasia (*śleṣa*) and antithesis (a form of *viṣama*)

Such points of similarity [3] however, which may be held

1 Cp De HSL pp 205–6 but he objects here to calling these works prose romances We may or may not use the foreign term for our prose *kāvyas* but the fact remains that there is close affinity between the two see below

2 Cp Kād 2nd ed. intro pp 101 ff also Weber IS XVIII 456 ff

3 Also cp L. H Gray Vās intro pp 35 ff but he rightly refused to admit any relation or interdependence between the two romances

to be coincidental rather than based on any actual contact cannot positively prove borrowing on either side As a matter of fact there is fundamental difference between the two romances While in Sanskrit romance supreme emphasis is put on formal decoration and minute depiction of nature and the thread of narrative is broken at places and characterisation often neglected in Greek romance stress has been laid on the continuity of narrative and the rhetorical embellishment and depiction of nature have been entirely overlooked The Sanskrit romance as we have seen derives its inspiration with regard both to content and form from native sources be it either folk tale literature or the metrical *kāvya* and it is futile to try to find an alien influence thereon [1] As a matter of fact there should be solid grounds for proving influence of one literature upon another We cannot link literatures on the delicate basis of similar points or characteristics which are often observed in literatures belonging to quite different times and climes

PREDECESSORS OF DAṆḌIN

Daṇḍin in the introductory verses of his *Avantisundarīkathā* refers to a good number of predecessors in poetry drama and prose Among the poets who find a mention in him are Vālmīki,[2] (Vyāsa) the arranger of *Mahābhārata* Sarvasena who wrote a work probably named *Harivijaya* the celebrated Kālidāsa, one blind poet perhaps Kumāradāsa (c 517 26) who composed *Jānakīharaṇa* one Nārāyaṇa credited with the composition of three works and Mayūra (the author of *Sūryaśataka*) If P V Kane s conjecture be right Vijjakā has been referred to in a broken stanza of introduction [3] Bhāravi exalted as the

---

Lacôte on the other hand adduced evidence in favour of the borrowing of Greek romance from India cp Keith JRAS 1915) pp 754 ff HSL p 365–9

1 For a fuller discussion of the question cp Keith JRAS 1914) p 1103 (1915) pp 734 ff HSL pp 365 ff De HSL pp 201 2

2 Rām finds a mention in ASK p 20 where there is also allusion to MBhār Setu Bk and Kād

3 Cp ASK intro v 20 विजीयेव मम । या ह्यैनापि या नाना अत्र इयत्तुणात्मम, Kane HSP pp 95 6

creator of poetic speech (*gavam prabhavah*), and his friend, the poet Dāmodarasvāmin whom he introduced to the prince Viṣṇuvardhana, find a place in Dandin s autobiographical sketch at the threshold of the romance [1] Again Dandin refers, in the body of the romance, to the *Setubandha* of Pravarasena [2] The dramatists known to him are Bhasa and Kālidasa and probably Subandhu also whose *Vāsavadattanāṭyadhara* seems to have been alluded to in an introductory verse [3] Possibly he knew also the *Padmaprabhṛtaka* (describing the love of Muladeva and Devadattā) and *Mṛcchakaṭika* of Śudraka [4] Among the prose writers, he knew Gunādhya whose *Bṛhatkathā* has been referred to by him as a *katha*, and Bāna the writer of *Harṣacarita* and *Kadambari*,[5] and probably Subandhu also, a reference to whom seems to have been lost He also refers to Dhavala's *Manovati* and a work *Śudrakacarita* in Tamil by Lalitālaya which are now lost [6]

These predecessors of his must have influenced him in respect of content or form or both The impact of the authors of the two Epics and of Kālidāsa and Śudraka may be traced in numerous places Among the prose writings Gunādhya's *Bṛhatkathā*, now lost seems to have influenced him the most with regard to his plot in general and certain incidents and motifs in particular He must have also derived inspiration from the prose works mentioned by Patañjali, and the lost writings of Vararuci Rāmila Somila Śrīpalita, Dhavala and Bhaṭṭara Haricandra But the main source of inspiration must have been the works of Subandhu (c 600) and Bana (c 606 46 A D) We can understand and appreciate the literary charac teristics and achievements of our author only in the background

1 Cp ASK pp 9–10 also cp above pt I ch IV

2 Cp also KA I 34 also cp above pt I ch III

3 Verse 6 सुबन्धु किल निष्क्रान्तो बिन्दुसारस्य बन्धनात् । तस्यैव हृदय बन्ध्वा वत्सराजो Abhinavagupta (AB GOS ed. vol III pp 172 178) also refers to him cp Kane HSP pp 142-3

4 Cp intro vs 8-9 also cp M R Kavi ASK intro pp 7-8 G H Sastri ASKS intro p x

5 Cp (a) KA I 38 ASK intro v 7 p 20 (b) ASK intro v 19 p 20 (Kād.)

6 Cp (a) ASK intro v 21 (b) *ib* p 13

of the literary trends and tendencies observed in the works of these two great romancers of 7th century A D almost to which period Daṇḍin also belongs There is a close affinity in the works of these writers with regard to art and style and it is in the fitness of things, therefore, to examine in brief the main characteristics of art and diction of these predecessors of Daṇḍin

Subandhu, the author of *Vāsavadattā*, is the predestinator of the trend which does not put as much stress on incidents as on descriptions, however of digressive nature Little does he attend to his narrative instead he interests himself in the depiction of the lover and beloved and of the frowns and smiles of fortune in store for them He richly embroiders these descriptions with romantic commonplaces of poetry which constitute the bulk of his work In the course of elaborate depictions, he amply displays his *śāstric* learning and technical skill He laboriously employs the poetic figures like simile and metaphor and strings them with a long chain of puns (*śleṣa*), in the use of which he takes legitimate pride [1] It is important to note that Bāṇa and Daṇḍin also take pleasure in frequent employment of the figure, *śleṣa* [2] which often strains the language and diction Subandhu believes in a cult of style which prefers the extraordinary way of expression and disdains the ordinary manner He cares more for the ornamental aspect of art than for the poetical possibilities of his subject [3]

Bāṇa also presents the same literary inspiration and the same characteristics of art and style But he happily commands an additional quality, namely the supreme gift of poetic imagination which amply compensates for all his weakness for stylistic accomplishments Although like his predecessor he delights in elaborating his narratives with lengthy and digressive descrip

---

1 Cp Intro v 13 where he qualifies himself as skilled in the art of employing paronomasia in every syllable'

2 Bāṇa (Kād Intro v 9) speaks of compositions abounding in unending series of puns which captivate the minds of the connoisseurs while Daṇḍin also eulogises the figure in KA II 363 also cp above pt II

3 Cp for detail De HSL pp 217 ff Keith HSL pp 307 ff CSL pp 63 5

tions, his sense of proportion often comes to his rescue and saves his plot from boredom In comparison with Subandhu, his outstanding merits are his power of close observation and graphic description, his love of nature with its charming colour and music the richness of his fancy and his wonderful command over language There is a deep sentimental and poetic touch in his works which we notice in his skilful depiction of romantic and youthful love in its joys and sorrows and hopes and fears He is a master of florid and finished style which is able to convert the rough stones of popular literature into gems of poetic beauty The historical censure of his style by Weber who compared his elaborate prose with a typical Indian jungle may be justified from modern point of view about literature, but it is unjust to apply modern standards of criticism to his style which does not claim to be judged thereby The blame in fact should go to the age that patronises a trend which aspires to produce the graces of poetry in prose [1]

The two romancers faithfully reflect in their works the trends and tendencies of the contemporary art and style In the field of poetry also the age exhibits more or less similar characteristics It is not just therefore, to condemn these aspirants for their queer mentality or bad taste, for the question is vital and requires an historical evaluation We do not mean that these writers are faultless but what we want to emphasise is that their fault lies in their blindly following the ill trodden path of the time The standard that was set by the age was both faulty and difficult to follow, but the writers could not realise its fault and surmounted the difficulty by their wide learning and constant practice with unabated zeal and fervour The characteristic features of this standard were unending series of descriptions laborious employment of poetic figures and especially of simile, metaphor and alliteration and paronomasia, exuberance of fanciful imagination and elaborate use of lengthy *compounds and formation of long enormous sentences Daṇḍin* verily echoes the trend of the time when he asserts that a

---

1 Cp for Bāna Keith HSL pp 314 ff CSL pp 65-9 De HSL pp 225 ff

profusion of compact compounds is the essence of prose that paronomasia is the beautifier of all poetic figures and that hyperbole is the best form of figurative expression [1] These dicta of Daṇḍin faithfully echo, and in turn are faithfully reechoed in, the works of the writers of the age His concession that a writer can achieve poetry of course of lesser order by dint of his vast learning and persistent labour, even if he is deficient in poetic imagination,[2] reflects in reality the general tendency of the age wherein the scholars aspired to become poets and the poets promised themselves to display their *śāstric* learning Again, it is in literal deference to the literary tendencies of the time that he patronises the tradition which demands of a poet to incorporate in his *kāvya* the descriptions of varied nature, such as those of cities mountains and oceans, of different seasons and of great events and emotions of life,[3] regardless of the scope of the content of his work

1 Cp. KA I 80 II 363 and 214 respectively for these dicta also see above pt II chs. IV and VI
2. Cp KA I 104-5
3 Cp KA I 16-7 29

CHAPTER II

CIRCUMSTANCES, CHARACTERISTICS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE AGE

In order to make a proper appreciation of the characteristics and achievements of Sanskrit prose *kāvya*, it is imperative to understand fully the circumstances under which it originated and the environments in which it developed Sanskrit *kavya*, along with its various forms, has been, from the very beginning closely associated with royal courts, and the contact, which remained intact throughout the long history of its development has exercised a deep impact on its content form and spirit The royal patronage bestowed on the poets, apart from wealth and fame, the requisite leisure and spirit essential for serious composition One of the results of this affiliation of poetry to the royal courts is the aristocratic character of Sanskrit *kāvya* which faithfully mirrors the graces as well as the artificialities of the courtly life It was the courtly atmosphere which inspired the richness of fancy and luxuriance of style and inclination towards what attracts the eye in preference to what touches the heart, in Sanskrit poets [1]

The establishment in the 4th century A D of the Gupta empire which is unanimously styled as the golden epoch of Indian history, and the brāhmanical renaissance accompanying it provided a congenial atmosphere for and also gave an impetus to the growth of art and literature and the tremendous momentum of this great inspiration lasted for centuries and is clearly observed in the literary life of 7th century A D The re-establishment of the brahmanical ideal of life replacing the pessimistic attitude of Buddhism restored the wealth (*artha*) and pleasure (*kama*) to their legitimate position equal to that of duty (*dharma*) and final emancipation (*mokṣa*) as objects of life, and

1 Cp De HSL pp 18-9

the new attitude is amply reflected in contemporary art and literature which attached due importance to the delineation of love and pleasure In fact, the tradition of erotic poetry goes back to very early times As early as Patañjali (second century B C) love is established as one of the dominant themes of poetry [1] The great human emotion is deified as Kamadeva the flower arrowed god with charming personality which receives the fullest possible development in Sanskrit *kavya* The revival of the old healthy view of life put forth a general demand for beauty, love and refinement and it was duly met by the celebration of various festivities with pomp and show and by the public entertainments in the form of dance music and play And as was natural, the *kavya* of this period reproduced the optimistic ideal of brahmanical life The dominant theme of love made its appearance in Sanskrit *kavya* in the accompaniment of the social environment which consisted of *nagaraka* or the typical man about town and his lady companion the accomplished courtesan (*ganika*) The culture, hobbies and habits of a *nagaraka* had a great bearing on the character of Sanskrit *kavya* which also exhibits a deep impact of his lady companion who occupied a well recognised position in society by virtue of her beauty wealth and artistic accomplishments [2] The prevailing urban atmosphere created by the cultured man about town tended to shift the emphasis on literary effort from originality and profound inspiration to scholarship and skill , but it also safeguarded the literary output from falling below a certain level because of its insistence on good taste [3] The science of Erotics also exercised a profound impact on Sanskrit *kavya* The treatment of erotic sentiment greatly occupied the minds of love theorists as well as of rhetoricians and poets In order to appreciate the love poetry of Sanskrit it is essential to study both the fundamentals of the science of Erotics and the literary traditions recorded in the rhetorical writings which present a subtle and elaborate analysis of the emotion of love

---

1 Cp Keith HSL pp 47 8 De HSL p 19 and fn
2 Cp D HSL pp 20-2 Keith HSL pp 51 ff
3 Cp K Chaitanya NHSL p 25

Without the background of some knowledge of these manuals, one is likely to misunderstand the aspect of Sanskrit love poetry which freely indulges in the minute description of feminine beauty and sexual pleasure We do not mean that there is nothing objectionable in Sanskrit love poetry, for, we do observe, here and there, nude and vulgar sensuality in the pictures of love sports and we must censure it

The Sanskrit *kāvya* was further influenced by the standard set by *sahṛdaya*, the connoisseur or the man of taste with cultivated mind, whose critical judgement finally shaped the form of poetry[1] Although *pratibhā* (poetic imagination or creative faculty), which may be aided by culture (*vyutpatti*), the knowledge of technique of poetry and practice (*abhyāsa*) which makes a man perfect was generally considered to be the essential condition for an aspiring poet, some theorists including Daṇḍin stressed the value of culture and practice even at the cost of *pratibhā*,[2] and consequently the unhealthy idea of 'educating and thereby 'manufacturing' a poet came into being[3] The unwholesome attitude made poetry a learned pursuit In such an atmosphere which prevailed in the sphere of *belles lettres* almost from the beginning spontaneity of poetry naturally gave way to elaboration and artificiality Learned ingenuity replaced true poetic genius and extravagance of fancy and erudition usurped the place of real feeling and perspicuity No doubt, there were gifted poets who aspired for real poetry, but the general tendency was inclined towards a blind adherence to rules and regulations The slavish tendency of the poets resul ted into the development of a set paraphernalia of traditional

1 Cp De HSL pp 24-5 K Chaitanya NHSL pp 24-5 for *sahṛdaya* cp Abhinavagupta on DhA I 1 f (ed. Jagannath Pathak pp 24 5)

2 KA I 104-5 cp De *op cit* pp 25 ff Keith *op cit* pp 340-1 cp also above pt II ch II

3 We have a long list of arts and sciences which are to be studied by a man aspiring for poetry in rhetorical writings esp cp Bhāmaha I 9, Rudraṭa I 18 Vāmana I 3 20-1 Later books were written for the practical guidance of poets in the art of poetry cp De HSP II pp 357 ff also cp Keith HSL pp 338 ff

story telling and a number of poetic conventions [1] The conventionality of themes and descriptions discouraged originality and suppressed poetic individuality to a considerable extent and thereby hindered a free movement of Sanskrit *kavya*

Again the peculiar conception of *kavya* which was regarded, more or less as a piece of literary composition romantic in matter and sentimental in character and above all strictly perfect in form and diction, affected its nature and scope and also its growth The fact that the term *kāvya* commanded a wide scope comprehending any literary piece of imagination whether it be in prose or verse results into an insalubrious tendency of developing similar art and style for the metrical and prose forms of literary composition And as was natural the art and style of metrical *kāvya* invaded the sphere of prose with the result that the prose form was unduly marked with poetic stamp In theory it may have been a wise step to discard the metre, an external factor, as a means of demarcation of poetry, but in practice it seriously hampered a natural development of prose as prose Prose and poetry may be essentially one in spirit, but they are entirely different in rhythm, diction and technique and hence can never reconcile with each other Judged from modern measure stick of literary criticism, Sanskrit prose *kāvya*, wherein the elements of poetry and prose have been interwoven together in an unnatural way the former overpowering the latter, presents a strange type of literary form The prose which may be regarded as such from modern standard —the simple, fluent and forceful prose,—could never develop in Sanskrit under the circumstances described above

OUTSTANDING CHARACTERISTICS AND ACHIEVEMENTS

Although Sanskrit *kavya* suffers from certain serious defects it must be admitted that it possesses some outstanding merits which can be appreciated only when it is viewed in right perspective of its limitations and the circumstances conditioning its origin and development Sanskrit poetry, it must be confessed

---

1 For *kavisamayas* or poetic conventions cp KMīm. XIV-XVI SD VII 23 ff

is not the spontaneous outcome of powerful emotions but the fact remains that it very often succeeds in creating an impression of spontaneity with freshness of poetic art and style

The Sanskrit *kāvya* delights in the beauty of words It possesses a rare gift of melodious sound effects which the poets skilfully produce by a matching combination of soft vocables The unique susceptibility of the poets to fine variations of sound 'to which literatures of other countries afford few parallels[1] was duly recognised by the theorists who classified diction on the basis of the pleasing effect of sounds and dealt with verbal figures like *anuprāsa* and *yamaka* in detail

The peculiar quality of flexibility of Sanskrit language, which afforded a free and frequent occurrence of musical assonances also encouraged the subtle employment of *double entendre* as a fine artistic device, and the theory gave its full support to the practice by glorifying the device as an element which adds to the charm of poetic expression No doubt it involves the straining of language and stands in the way of free enjoyment of aesthetic pleasure but if used with due sense of proportion, its negative aspect disappears and it helps the realisation of poetic delight

Again the peculiar genius of the language permitted a free use of long strings of compounds in *kāvya* and especially in prose compositions, and the theorists accorded their willing *recommendation to the tendency by exalting the profusion of* compounds as the very essence of prose[3] The unique device, if employed judiciously enhances the charm of diction and picturesqueness of descriptions It is a forceful means of synthetic expression with a singular power of compression It brings about compactness both in matter and diction and produces a group picture of a series of allied objects

Another outstanding feature of Sanskrit *kāvya* is its peerless quality of metaphorical expression which theorists commended as the quintessence of poetic diction[4] It lends force and

1 Cp E H Johnstone trans of Buddh intro
2 KA II 363 also cp above ch I
3 KA I 80 also cp De HSL p 34
4 Cp KA I 100 तदेतत्काव्यसर्वस्वं समाधिर्नाम यो गुण ।

beauty to a *kāvya* if there is freshness of originality and brilliance of imagination accompanying it. If however it is used deliberately for scholastic effects, it loses its charm and becomes tiresome. Sanskrit poetry is also rich in figurative expression. A judicious employment of figures like simile and metaphor enriches poetical fancy and embellishes word pictures in the sphere of which also Sanskrit *kāvya* stands unique. For the sake of effecting beauteous and graphic word paintings, it even overlooks at times the theme or narrative which fact forms one of its serious defects.

The general complaint that Sanskrit poetry is indifferent to the problems of human life, and consequently it does not possess any great tragedy or light comedy is no doubt genuine but as a matter of fact it reflects in this respect the peculiar trend of Indian mind which faced neither physical strifes nor mental conflicts. The complacent attitude towards life and destiny prevented it from yielding to a sense of suffering or discontent. The serene and satiated mood was the result of a profound faith in God and His justice, which made the people idealistic in outlook, and created a congenial atmosphere for the idealised creation of art and literature in which there are no cavities or angularities of the vicissitudes of life.[1] The theorists also contributed to the healthy attitude of poets by drawing a line of distinction between the real world of hard facts and the imaginary sphere of art and poetry wherein the problems of life yield place to pleasures of romantic realm. Even the sorrows and sufferings depicted in poetry do not disturb the even temper of mind and instead, they impart supreme poetic pleasure, appearing as they do in impersonalised form of pure aesthetic character. The peculiar condition of mind realising the aesthetic delight is technically called *rasa* which has been recognised as the soul of poetic art. The idea of *dhvani* or suggestion also, which existed in spirit in quite an early age encouraged the idealistic outlook on art and poetry by opposing the direct and express portrayal of life and its problems in poetry. But it is unjust to say that Sanskrit *kāvya* is totally devoid of any interest

1 Cp De HSL pp 36-7 Keith HSL pp 345-6 350

in problems of human life, for it does depict life and its eternal problems in the form of human emotions of love and disgust, humour and pathos, heroism and fear and terror and wonder which it ably delineates in their multifarious forms and aspects [1]

One of the remarkable achievements of Sanskrit poetry is its unique power of delineating nature in its multiformity of phenomena with matching colours Of course, there is much which is conventional and stale, but freshness of observation is not altogether wanting Natural phenomena often accompany corresponding emotional aspects of human life and they make the colour and impression of each other faster and deeper The various objects of nature also supply a poet with requisite material for their similes and metaphors and other allied figures Nature serves in this respect as a befitting background for human emotions and especially for the predominant emotion of love which gets perhaps the most out of the natural phenomena including the six seasons which have been elegantly portrayed in Sanskrit *kāvya* with special reference to various moods of lovers and their beloved in different seasons

These outstanding features of Sanskrit *kāvya* make ample compensation for the tediousness or artificiality which tends to disfigure its fair face and as Kalidāsa the greatest of Sanskrit poets rightly declares one defect amidst the multitude of excellences sinks into triviality like one blot on the beautiful face of the moon [3]

1 Cp the *rasas* see above pt II ch VIII
2. Cp for detail De HSL pp 18–42 Keith HSL pp 338–51
3 Cp Kum. I 3 एको हि दोषो गुणसंनिपाते निमज्जतीन्दोः किरणेष्विवाङ्कः ।

CHAPTER III

PROSE WORKS OF DANDIN AND HIS ART

FORM AND NATURE OF DAṆḌIN'S PROSE WORKS

Prose *kāvya* in Sanskrit, broadly speaking, falls into two classes, namely, *ākhyāyikā* and *kathā*. According to Bhāmaha who gives perhaps for the first time a clear conception of the two classes of prose composition, the subject matter in an *ākhyāyikā* deals with facts of actual experience, though scope is allowed to poetic invention, and the tale may contain subjects like abduction of a maiden, fighting, separation and the final triumph of the hero. The narrator of the story herein is the hero himself; the tale is divided into *ucchvāsas* and verses in *vaktra* and *aparavaktra* metres occur, here and there, suggestive of future course of events. Again, it is marked by a peculiar sign indicative of the poet's particular intention, and above all, it is composed in Sanskrit in fine and elegant diction. In a *kathā*, on the other hand, the theme is generally an invented story, the narrator is some one else than the hero, there is no division into *ucchvāsas* nor *vaktra* and *aparavaktra* verses and the medium is either Sanskrit or Prakrit or Apabhraṁśa.[1]

Daṇḍin also (about a quarter of a century earlier than Bhāmaha) puts forth a similar, though not very clear, conception of the two classes. He is silent about the nature of subject matter and allows a *kathā* to be told by the hero also and likewise an *ākhyāyikā* by some one other than the hero. He also notices the name *lambha* for chapters in a *kathā* and mentions *āryā* metre with reference to this form. He, however, does not patronise this twofold division and regards the points of difference as just formal variations and not as essential marks of distinction. In strict accordance with his attitude in theory, he boldly discards these distinguishing marks in practice by not

---

1 BKAl I 25-9; also cp KA I 23-30; see above pt I ch II

observing them in his two prose *kāvyas* which, therefore, cannot be rigidly placed in either of the two forms Both of his romances deal with an invented story and there is no strict uniformity with regard to the person of the narrator Again, while *Daśakumāracarita* follows the division into *ucchvāsas* which is a characteristic mark of an *ākhyāyikā*, the other romance has no division at all There is no definite scheme with regard to the metre also, both the works contain *ārya* metre allowed only in a *kathā*, while the *Avantisundarīkathā* has a *vasantatilaka* verse which is not admitted in theory in either form [1] If, however, we take Rudrata s conception of an *ākhyāyikā* and accept *Harsacarita* as a typical specimen thereof we would find that the *Avantisundarīkatha*, though styled a *kathā* and called as such in the body of the work also [3] approximates to the *ākhyāyikā* class modelled as it seems to be on the said *ākhyāyikā* of Bana Like *Harsacarita* it contains an introduction in verse with 26 stanzas in *anuṣṭubh* and one in *ārya*, paying an obeisance to the famous trinity of gods and homage to the great poets and writers like Vālmiki Vyāsa Panini Bhāsa Kālidasa and Bāṇa Then comes the prose story the introductory part of which gives an account of Daṇḍin making him as the narrator of the tale which is said to have been related by him to his friends The work, however, is not divided into chapters as demanded by the rules governing an *ākhyāyika* This characteristic on the other hand is noticed in the *Daśakumaracarita* which otherwise gives the general appearance of a *kathā* though named a *carita* probably at the instance of the *Harṣacarita* an *akhyayika* If the introductory part of the work had been preserved to us we would have been able to determine the form of the romance more precisely What is clear, however is that the two works cannot be rigidly classified into either of the two forms though they do illustrate the general characteristics of Sanskrit prose *kavya* As a matter of fact Daṇḍin has deliberately obliterated the superficial marks of distinction between the two forms which

1 Cp *ārya* in DKC pp 99 156 ASK p 9 *vasantatilaka* in ASK p 223
2. Cp RKAl XVI 20-30 see above pt II ch II
3 ASK p 17

he regards as essentially one,[1] and if judged from modern view point, he has fully succeeded in his task, though the Sanskrit theorists who did not quote his romances till very late period could not appreciate his disregard of convention with the result that while one of his works is available today in incomplete and broken form the other composition is at its best a patchwork

Daṇḍin was a writer with true revolutionary spirit who followed the old traditions which suited him but boldly repudiated the rigid conventions which stood in the way of his artistic taste and the modern critic, if not the old theorist is all praise for his logical stand His romances, and especially the *Daśakumaracarita* which frankly describe, jointly or severally, the corrupt practices of society, like gambling, theft fraud, murder, impersonation abduction and rape differ considerably *both in matter and spirit, from the normal specimens of prose kavya* which usually deal with a good subject and delineate a noble hero

In modern terminology of literary criticism the two works of Daṇḍin come in the category of prose fiction and can be approximated to some extent to its form popularly known as novel which has been defined as "an invented prose narrative of considerable length and a certain perplexity that deals imaginatively with human experience through a connected sequence of events involving a group of persons in a specific setting "[2] W H Hudson calls this class of literary composition " the loosest form of literary art and the most elastic and irregular of all the great forms of literary expression "[3] If the above concession granted to this form be admitted the prose *kavyas* of Daṇḍin can legitimately be called novels though all the characteristic elements of modern novel may not be traced in the old classics There are of course serious points of difference particularly in art and style between the two but they should not strike us much in view of the great distance between them both of time and clime Their fundamental oneness is

1 Cp KA I 28 तत्कथाख्यायिकेत्येका जातिः संज्ञाद्वयाङ्किता ।
2 Cp Webster's Eng Dict 1961 ed
3 *Intro to Study of Lit* pp 129-30

affirmed beyond doubt by the following remarks made on the origin of novel by W H Hudson, which apply fully well to the works of Dandin "Novel owes its existence to the interest which men and women everywhere and at all times have taken in men and women and in the great panorama of human passion and action [1] The prose compositions of Dandin very closely approach in content and spirit if not in form and technique to the adventure novels of modern literature wherein there is a series of almost independent tales, finally related to, or strung with, the adventurous deeds of the hero [2]

The Sanskrit prose *kāvyas* are generally styled today as prose romances The term romance which is defined as a prose tale based on legend chivalric love and adventure or the supernatural [3] is very appropriate at least when applied to the prose *kāvyas* of Daṇḍin though the recent conception of romance as a prose narrative having romantic characteristics like delineation of imaginary characters unrelated to everyday life or treatment of the remote in time or place the heroic the adventurous and often the mysterious,[4] may not suit them well The story in a romance insistently enters the sphere of poetry and unfolds itself through the medium of poetic elements and there is a confluence of various streams of episodes coming from different directions and all crowded with a large number of characters belonging to this very world, though to be very rarely seen in actual life They are adventurous and brave people helping the wretched and specially the ladies in distress and vanquishing their rivals in matters of love A romance depicts an ideal and ethereal love, and emotional atmosphere pervades through the whole work [5] These and other allied features of a romance are noticeable more or less in almost all the prose *kāvyas* of Sanskrit in general and in the works of Daṇḍin in particular The romantic interest which takes us to a strange world of marvel and magic runs through the works of Daṇḍin wherein

1 Cp *op cit*
2. Cp D R Upadhyaya in HSK p 154
3 Cp Webster s Eng Dict 1961 ed
4 Cp *op cit*
5 Cp D R Upadhyaya *op cit* p 153

we hear of a collyrium which makes the user invisible or look like an ape, of a prisoner s chain which turns into a nymph of a lotus which transforms into a *vidyadhara* of the curious art of stealing which converts overnight the paupers into millionaires and *vice versa* and of the magical trick which brings beauteous damsels from afar We breathe here in a world which is real in one sense and quite unreal in another for the poet s attitude is both romantic and realistic and consequently in his works, we notice ' the brier of realism and the rose of romance cleverly combined in a unique literary form [1] In fact, if understood properly, both the elements go together as they originate from the same basic instincts which in the case of the former appertain to our delight in seeing the near and the familiar while in romance they refer to human pleasure in the remote and the unfamiliar [2] In Daṇḍin s writings the two elements move in perfect harmony with admirable sense of restraint It was his aim to portray what he saw around him in romantic form and he has achieved it with great success Although the nobler aspects of life find a scarce portrayal in him yet it must be admitted that whatever aspect of life he has chosen to delineate he has delineated it faithfully with the grasp and thoroughness of a first hand knowledge of the subject matter He exhibits in his works the unique quality of what is called the poetic truth

The prose *karyas* of Daṇḍin, and particularly his *Dasa kumaracarita* closely approach both in matter and spirit to the picaresque romances of Europe of 18th century which deal with rogues and vagabonds (*picaro*) of cosmopolitan cities and wherein the story is a series of incidents or episodes connected chronologically but with little or no motivation or complication of plot Daṇḍin s romances give a lively picture of dissolute and fraudulent rogues brave robbers expert thieves passionate lovers unfaithful wives coquettish harlots cunning paramours and procuresses and above all of hypocritical ascetics and greedy priests inhabiting the great cities of the day The chief

1 Cp De HSL p 215
2 Cp Hudson *Intro to Study of Lit* pp 16? ?

motives behind the roguish acts are the overwhelming mania for sexual delights and irresistible lust for the possession of a throne The curious and mysterious atmosphere has been made still more mystified by the lively elements of folk tale, *viz*, living interest in the narrative, power of vivid characterisation and subtle caricature a keen sense of amusing wit and humour and piquant satire All these outstanding qualities clothed in the best garb of literary art make the works of Dandin stand apart from the normal prose writings of Sanskrit and bring them near the picaresque novels of Victorian age, and in this respect the supreme credit goes to Dandin for creating a new genre in Sanskrit prose fiction

THE PLOT *DAŚAKUMARACARITA*

The plot of the *Daśakumāracarita* appears on the whole to be the poet's own creation and there is no evidence of whole sale borrowing on his part, though he might have derived inspiration from some legendary or historical sources or from the lost *Bṛhatkatha* of Gunādhya with regard to certain incidents and motifs of his plot G J Agashe[1] has very industriously traced in the romance influences of the great work of Gunāḍhya represented today by its late recensions made by Budhasvāmin (c 9th century), Kṣemendra (middle of 11th century) and Soma deva (1063-81 A D) As points of similarity the following instances may be referred to (i) three ministers and their sons succeeding them in office, (ii) sons of old ministers as com panions of the prince (iii) the goddess, Vindhyavāsini granting a sword to a prince (iv) courtesan's mother scolding her daughter, (v) a magician ready to offer a princess to Caṇḍikā (vi) a wife in the previous birth, (vii) *vidyadhara* predicting sovereignty to the prince, (viii) a man snatching off an anklet from the foot of a lady (ix) a prince, in pursuance of a boar reaching the nether land and winning a princess there, (x) a nun acting as a procuress, (xi) a ship wreck on the coast of Ceylon,

---

1 Intro to DKC pp xl-xliii He however adduces the evidence to prove DKC's direct indebtedness to the versions of Kṣemendra and Somadeva cp above pt I ch III

(xii) a *vidyādharī* cursed to be born as a mortal (xiii) a boy passed off as a girl to win the princess and (xiv) transformation of body[1] Besides, we have in our work a reference to the *vidyādharas*, Vīraśekhara, Mānasavega and Vegavat and to the enmity between Naravahanadatta and Vīraśekhara after the work of Guṇāḍhya[2] Again, the manner in which Rājavahana and his associates re-united after curious adventures relate their tales in *Daśakumaracarita* and the peculiar device of emboxing stories in the sixth *ucchvasa* find parallels in the *Bṛhatkathā* The stories of Dhūminī and Nitambavatī may also be traced back to Guṇāḍhya s work[3] Daṇḍin may be indebted to Guṇāḍhya for all or some of the above motifs and incidents which he successfully incorporates into his romance, but the conception of the plot as a whole is his own Some of the incidents described in the work and especially in its last *ucchvasa* may reflect certain historical events of his time, but the fact can not set aside the credit of originality enjoyed by the great writer

THE MAIN STREAM OF NARRATIVE

The *Daśakumāracarita* as the name indicates is a tale of adventures of ten *kumaras* headed by the prince Rajavāhana son of Rājahaṁsa, the lord of Puṣpapura The nine companions of the prince are sons either of ministers or of their brothers, two of them, however being sons of the king s friend, Prahāravarman, the ruler of Videha The *kumāras* have been united together by the artificial device of repeated coincidences Rājavāhana's association with the four sons of ministers is

1 Cp (i) BKM II 1 39 VII 1 560 2 DKC pp 4 5 (ii) BKM IV 1 132–4 DKC pp 12 3 (iii) BKM II 2 25 DKC p 7 (iv) BKM II 2 87-100 DKC pp 65-8 (v) BKM III 1 218 DKC pp 172 3 (vi) BKM IV 1 61 DKC p 46 (vii) BKM V 1 15 DKC p 12 (viii) BKM V 1 139 DKC p 169 (ix) BKM V 1 224 DKC p 64 (x) BKM VII 1 418 DKC pp 164 ff 168 ff (xi) BKM VIII 1 40 DKC pp 17 156 (xii) BKM VIII 1 50 DKC p 60 (xiii) KSS XII 22 27-31 98-103 DKC pp 146 8 (xiv) KSS VIII 6 60–4 DKC III and VII

2. Cp KSS XIV 1 esp 65 ff DKC p 60

3 Cp KSS X 9 1-40 XII 8 155-81 for the two stories respectively cp DKC pp 157 8 167-70 there is striking similarity in phraseology also

natural and the case of other two princes, Apahāravarman and Upahāravarman the sons of Prahāravarman, who are rescued and brought to the place where Rājavāhana lives, may be pleaded on the ground that happy coincidence is not altogether a remote possibility But the chance which picks and brings other three *kumāras* from distant places does not convince us The author has tried to lessen the degree of improbability by locating Rājahamsa s camp near the hermitage of Vamadeva whose disciples frequently visit far off places of pilgrimage, and in one case he has also sought the assistance of Tārāvalı a semi divine being in his task of uniting the *kumāras* The union though by rare tricks of chance was essential for the further development of plot The device however, by which the ten princes who set out in unison for quarter conquest, are separated from one another has been skilfully conceived and finely executed In course of their conquest journey they reach the heart of the Vindhya forest where their leader enters some chasm in order to assist one Mātanga in his mission to win a maiden When he comes back he does not find there his friends who had already moved to different directions in search of their hero Rājavāhana also sets out in search of them and by a pleasing but not incredible play of chance meets two of his companions Somadatta and Puṣpodbhava near Viśalā (Ujjayinī) and hears the tale of their adventurous deeds Having despatched Somadatta for Paṭalī the spot of his victorious encounter, he enters the city of Ujjayini which affords him the happy chance for marrying the royal princess Avantisundarī They are legally married in presence of the sacred fire through the trickish contrivance of a friendly conjuror who makes the officiating king Caṇḍavarman believe at the time that the marriage forms merely a part of the magic show [1] The introduction of the magician into the tale though a strange coincidence is clever and original Rajavahana s capture consequent upon the exposure of the trick and his lock up into a wooden cage were necessary for giving the story a desired turn The author significantly selects a wooden cage in order to afford the captive an easy escape when his feet are unfettered Here supernatural element comes forward to help the story proceed further the silver chain

which binds the prince's feet is a nymph cursed to the present form for a period of two months which is over just when his release is essential for his meeting with the lost friends Again it is the introduction of some *vidyadhara*, a supernatural being into the story that brings about the fettering of the prince s feet and his fateful capture The intervention of the retired king Mānasāra in the matter of the prince s execution and the con sequent waiting for the final orders of the king, Darpasāra who is away in penance as also the officiating king s military expe dition against Campā in the meantime go a long way in giving the prince a lucky chance for release and re union with his associates Pending Darpasāra s decision, the prince is taken, along with the army, to Campā where his other friends, now all kings, assemble as allies, to defend the king of Campā, Upahāra varman coming from Videha Arthapāla from Kāśī, Pramati from Śrāvastī Mitragupta from Suhma, Mantragupta from Āndhra Kaliṅga and Viśruta from Vidarbha Apahāravarman, who kills Caṇḍavarman the officiating king of Ujjayinī when the poor fellow is about to take the hand of the Campā princess Ambālikā in marriage, had already settled in the city They all relate in succession their stories of triumphant adventures to Rājavāhana the chief hero The ingenious device by which the ten princes narrate their fortunes brings about a unity in the story which otherwise would have been a series of unconnected tales

From Campā where Somadatta summoned from Pāṭalī joins them they all set out for Magadha their original place of start Puṣpodbhava s position here is not clear he is not shown to be present at Campā In the original work of Daṇḍin he might have been called along with Somadatta from Ujjayinī

In accordance with the literary tradition the work has a happy ending which has been worked out in a logical way All the ten princes succeed in their adventurous missions and finally each one of them is in possession of a realm and a beauteous spouse The chief hero enjoys paramount sovereignty over a vast land, almost the whole of India excepting its north western part, comprising of the various territories won by his compa nions who serve their leader as his feudatories

SUBSIDIARY CURRENTS OF THE NARRATIVE

1 The tale of Somadatta s adventure (pp 30–4) relates his capture on the charge of theft (though he was innocent, he had just picked up a jewel from road side knowing the least that it was a stolen property) by Mattakāla the king of Lāta, his escape, and entry, along with other prisoners, into the rival camp of Mānapāla, the minister of the Patali ruler and finally his overthrowing the Laṭa king with the help of Patali forces The last heroic act of his wins him both the realm and the princess of Patali The tale is simple and devoid of any complexity of incidents The introduction of the episode of the poor *bruhmana* whom the hero helps in right earnest by the gift of the jewel which brings about his own imprisonment is interesting it is essential too, for the future course of events On one hand, it unites the hero with the Paṭalī king through his 'fellow-thieves and, on the other, it provides him with a chance to exhibit his singular act of heroism Little did Mattakala know that he was giving in Somadatta a powerful fighter to his sworn enemy, the king of Pātali! The incidents, which have been skilfully woven together, proceed quite naturally towards the desired end

2 *The second story of Puṣpodbhava* (pp 34–41) deals with a different type of adventure Having re united with his lost parents after a long time the hero of the tale earns rich wealth with the help of some collyrium of magical virtue and settles in Ujjayinī There he falls in love with Bālacandrikā, sister of his friend Candrapala, whom Dāruvarman a member of the royal family, also loves He kills his rival Daruvarman, by the device of false rumour that Balacandrika would marry one who fights away the evil spirit which occupies her person The poor man is entrapped into the snare and loses his life since he has to encounter not the imaginary spirit in Balacandrika but his real opponent in Puṣpodbhava disguised as his love

Puṣpodbhava s reunion with his parents separated sixteen years ago is a hard coincidence, and in order to give it a natural look the device of prophecy and auspicious omen has been utilised but with little success The motif of the possession of person by evil spirits seems to be a prevalent device which has

been skilfully worked out by the writer The murder of Daruvarman by the trick is a clever improvement on the similar killing of Kicaka by Bhima in the *Mahābharata* [1]

3 *The tale of Apaharavarman* (in the second *ucchvasa* of the original work pp 64-102) which is "one of the longest and the best in the collection", describes his adventures in the city of Campa The hero engages himself in all sorts of notorious deeds He gambles robs the people of their riches, indulges in drinking and in its fit commits even murders He is arrested and put into prison where the jailor Kāntaka treacherously employs him for the construction of a subterranean passage from jail to the royal harem in order to win the princess Ambālikā Following the maxim, *tit for tat*, he kills Kāntaka and, entering the inner apartments through the underground passage wins the affection of the princess whom he marries after another act of murder, that of Caṇḍavarman who comes from Ujjayinī to take perforce her hand in marriage Finally he meets there Rājavāhana and other friends

The narrative which is itself very rich in varied incidents is skilfully interwoven with a number of episodes which add to the interest of the main story The episodic tale of Marīci and Kāmamañjarī (pp 65-72)[3] describes how the cunning harlot beguiles the ascetic into her false love and entices him into the meshes of her charms in order to win a wager thereby Having taken him to the pinnacle of love, she lets the poor fellow fall in the hard ground only to make him a laughing stock of the people The episode is cleverly linked up with the main narrative the hero wants to know the whereabouts of Rājavāhana and approaches the sage Marīci who was known for his divine sight obtained by the power of his austerities The sage narrates his tale of woe and asks him to settle at Campa and wait till he regains his lost power, this gives him an opportunity of making his fortune there The incident which is a fine example of irony of fate describes how courtesans can outwit even men of mature

1 Cp Virāṭa chs. 15-24 esp. 22. 52 ff
2. Cp De HSL p 211 also cp. A. W Ryder DKC trans Intro p 8
3 Lüders thought that the story is a transformation of the legend of Ṛṣyaśṛṅga cp Winternitz HIL, vol III pt I p 309 fn.

wisdom It was not merely a single woman's conspiracy, but was a united front of those who vended their beauty against those who would otherwise refuse to buy it The plot is well planned and still better worked out There is not a grain of suspicion in the mind of the sage who does everything in right earnest The atmosphere of sincerity is created by the clever exposition of the duties of a courtesan by the old mother of Kāmamañjari and is promoted by the latter's misleading interpretation of the three ends of life, namely *dharma artha* and *kama*, and elaborate reference to the precedents of gods and sages helplessly yielding to the predominant passion of love The harlot propounds in letter the superiority of *dharma* (duty) over *artha* (wealth) and *kama* (love), but in spirit she cleverly pleads otherwise The sage who is already under the overpowering influence of her love is taken in by her deceptive proposition and seconds her view in all sincerity saying, "you take a proper view of things when you say that the *dharma* of him who has known the truth is not obstructed by worldly enjoyment [1]

It is significant that the writer makes the sage to relate his miserable tale in the third person and not in the first as is his usual practice and succeeds thereby in sustaining our curiosity regarding the sage who reveals the fact at the end in the words And know me O noble youth to be the poor fellow who was thus befoolled by the whore which fall quite unexpectedly on the readers who could hardly imagine his so low a fall and so frank a confession of it from him

The next episode (pp 73–5) which appertains to the pathetic tale of another victim of the harlot is equally interesting though it is not interwoven with the main narrative with equal success The designing town sharpers who live by creating discord engender enmity between Virupaka an ugly but wealthy merchant and Sundaraka a poor but handsome youth, and by way of negotiating rule that one whom Kāmamañjarī, the ornament of youthful damsels, loves would win the banner of grace

---

1 DKC p 70

2 Cp *ib* p 72 यस्तयत्र हतस्तपस्वी तमत्र मा महाभाग ! मन्यस्व ।

True to her profession she chooses the wealthy though ill looking suitor who on his part makes her the mistress of his house his wealth and of what not till only a small piece of cloth to cover the privities is left with him Turned out by her only to be ridiculed by the people he, unable to bear the contempt embraces the Jain faith throwing off that strip of cloth also, but soon to come back to his own path when with his body be smeared with a thick layer of dust and smarting under the great pain caused by plucking off of the hair he is awfully tortured in matters like sitting sleeping and eating Apaharavarman restores his lost riches to him by the trickish device of the magic purse

The episode of Kulapālikā (pp 77 ff) a daughter of a rich merchant is skilfully interlinked with the main story The hero assists her in her mission to get her lover, Dhanamitra to whom she is originally betrothed, but who is now discarded by her parents on account of his being reduced to utter poverty Apahāravarman by the clever trick of the same magic purse makes her lover rich with the riches of his rival Arthapati the new suitor of the girl

The story contains besides the above side tales some interesting features the most important of them being the motif of the leather bag passed off as a purse of magical virtue which yielded riches to merchants and the best of courtesans on the condition that the supplicant must first restore to the rightful owner what he might have dishonestly got from him and give away to *brāhmaṇas* and gods whatever is earned by just means Apahāravarman while laying down the terms had the merchant Dharamitra in mind as perhaps also the courtesan Kāmamañjarī whom he offers the bag as a barter for her sister Rāgamañjarī The condition of restoring to the *bona fide* owner his wealth makes the courtesan to refund the wealth of Virupaka to him *The hero is thus able to get back the capital of his friend* with interest The purse has also been utilised for getting Arthapati arrested on the charge of its theft The main object of the bag however is to cover the crime of theft which it skilfully achieves.

Other notable features of the story are the incidents of

gamble and theft depicted on the line of *Mṛcchakaṭika*[1] which the work of Daṇḍin closely resembles both in matter and spirit Gambling procures for the hero, besides a large number of *dinaras* which he wins a sincere friend in Vimardaka who plays a vital role in the development of certain events in the story The incident of stealing links the Kulapālikā episode with the main story but the most interesting aspect of the notorious act is the description of complete burgling apparatus which the hero possesses Equally amusing is the apparently noble object of burglary, for the thief takes up the profession (which he extols as the path laid down by *Ācarya* Karnīsuta) in order to restore the rich but greedy people of Campā to normal state of mind by proving to them the transitoriness of worldly possessions[2]

The incidents of the narrative proceed in a logical way with a natural flow, and are in spirit quite in line with the character of the hero When in a fit of drunkenness he kills some royal officials, we naturally expect his execution as punishment for his murderous crime, but the writer cleverly saves him by entangling him in another case, that of theft of the magic purse The investigation into the new matter with the hope of the precious bag s recovery from him naturally delays his execution and in the meantime he betters his fate

4 The next story of Upahāravarman (in the third *ucchvāsa* pp 102 23) relates to his adventures in Videha, his own country, where he meets his old nurse and learns from her about his father s defeat and imprisonment and usurpation of his kingdom by his paternal cousins In order to secure the restoration of his father s fortunes, he develops illicit relations with the king Vikaṭavarman s wife Kalpasundari and taking her into confidence successfully plots against the life of her husband by the device of the motif of transformation of body He meets Rājavāhana and other friends at Campā where he goes as the king of Videha to help the Aṅga ruler

Upahāravarman s meeting with his old nurse is a happy

1 Cp DKC pp 76–7 cp Mṛcch. II and III respectively
2. DKC p 76

but not improbable, coincidence, the latter, now a nun lives in a small monastery near Mithila which the prince visits for rest after a long journey The difficult task of Kalpasundari s seduction has been accomplished by the introduction of Puṣkarikā, the nurse's daughter who is serving in the royal harem and is, therefore, in a position to help the hero in his mission Upahāravarman, with her help follows a well planned scheme and develops it gradually in accordance with the dicta of the *Kamasūtra*[1] The popular motif of love at the sight of lover in painting has been successfully employed in describing the queen s love for the prince The writer prepares an ample ground for her serious moral lapse In sharp contrast to the prince s handsome form, her husband has a mis shapen body Besides, he is cruel insolent and discourteous to her She expresses her strong distaste for him when she remarks that he is unworthy of her and has now started insulting her Puṣkarikā adds fuel to the fire by giving false reports about his illicit relations with a dancing maid

The motif of the transformation of body by magic skill has been beautifully conceived and the fatal plot is carried through with perfect skill The trick beguiles even his wise ministers who entertain no suspicion because the magical rite is to be performed by the queen herself and that too, in the premises of the harem The transformation is, significantly enough, to be effected by stages, first of all the queen is to be transformed and then her changed form is to be transferred to the king the queen assuming her original form again The process facilitates the prince s coming into the picture in female garb in the form of the transformed queen who is to transplant her new form on the king The ritual spot is deliberately kept unpeopled by any outsider The ringing of the bell serves as a signal for Upahāravarman to come and play the cruel game and the great sacrificial fire virtually becomes the funeral pyre for the king whose fatal mistake of the prince s voice for that of his wife can be reasonably accounted for by the latter s skill in the art of changing voice The condition of disclosure of all secrets for

1 Cp Kām III 3 9 5 2 5 V 2 1 4 2-4 14 63-4 etc

the transformation affords the prince to have a knowledge of confidential matters of the court, so that he is passed off, without suspicion as the transformed king though he changes his policy in the matters (for, one of the things to be confidentially done was to poison his own father to death) with the clever remark that with his figure, his nature too has changed [1]

The fact that the plotters do not forget to stand upon the name of morality even when they are up to a heinous crime adds to the sharpness of effect of the action Kalpasundari refers to Cupid as her father who has given her to the prince in the presence of the holy fire of love and to the fatal fire, as the sacrificial one before which she is again being given over to him in marriage by her heart while the prince derives inspiration from the moon god, known to be the seducor of his preceptor s wife and gets implicit concession from the writers of holy scriptures as also the express permission however in dream, of the god Ganeśa (whose partial incarnation he is said to have been) for his singular act of adultery And in the end his leader Rajavahana also puts his final stamp of approval on his criminal deeds

5 *In the next story* (pp 123 37) Arthapāla describes his adventures in Kasi where he meets one Purnabhadra who tells him the unhappy news of the award of death sentence to the minister Kamapala who happens to be his (Arthapāla's) father Arthapala saves the life of his father who was being taken to the place of execution by the clever device of anti poison charms His next adventure, the excavation of a subterranean passage to the royal palace where he takes the king captive wins for him besides the kingdom of Kaśī a beautiful damsel whom he finds in an underground chamber while digging the tunnel He then leads an army to the help of the Anga king and meets there in Campā his friends

The writer deliberately sends Arthapāla to Kaśī where his father badly needed his help Purnabhadra s significant introduction into the story unites in a natural way the prince with

1 Cp DKC p 121

2. DKC p 111 also cp ASKS V 75 ff

his father in distress The thrilling tale of Arthapāla has been befittingly interwoven with equally venturesome episodes of the thief Purnabhadra and the minister Kamapāla Supernatural element appears in the story in the form of Tārāvalī a semi divine lady, in order to explain certain events of rather incredible nature The risky game of anti poison charms has been skilfully played up by the prince who unnoticed by the crowd causes his father to be bitten by a snake and checks the venom from acting till he is fully cured of it

The episode of the princess Manikarnikā who is kept in a subterranean house for fear of abduction by men like Kāmapāla who perforce got and married Kāntimatī of the same royal family lends a romantic charm to the atmosphere of the story It is a great irony of fate that even from the place which was supposed to be most secure the princess is discovered and appropriated by Arthapāla the son of the previous offender [1]

6 *The story of Pramati* in the fifth *ucchvāsa* (pp 137 48) deals with his love adventure which yields to him into the bargain, a realm also The tale opens with the scene of the Vindhya forest whence the prince in slumber is mysteriously taken to the inner apartments of the Śrāvastī king He notices there, on the roof of the lofty palace, a white canopy looking like a portion of moon light cut off, silken bed stuffed with downy feathers beauteous maidens lying asleep at ease like nymphs in faint and among them a damsel of enchanting beauty lying on a bed covered with a silk mantle white like the orb of the autumnal moon The romantic atmosphere of mystery, wonder and beauty which has been successfully created by the writer begets love in the hearts both of the prince and the princess The prince s sudden restoration to his original place the leafy bed in the lonely jungle shrouds the atmosphere with mystery till it is ably cleared by the introduction of the *nymph Tārāvalī to whom the puzzling act of taking the prince* to and back from the royal harem is ascribed We notice in the incident a fine combination of natural and supernatural elements

The play of coincidence is conspicuous in the tale by its frequent occurrence Tārāvalī sees perchance Pramati lying

asleep on her way to Śrāvastı fair and takes him along in pity Again, she drops the idea of taking him to the fair just when she reaches, by aerial path, the royal harem While returning *from the festival she takes him back to the solitary grove* probably in order to avoid the disclosure of secret, and more than that, to give him a chance for independent adventures There is a tinge of unnaturalness also in some of the incidents The absence of any sign of fear or embarassment in the princess at the sudden sight of a stranger as also the non occur rence of any kind of untoward happening during the pretty long period of the prince s stay in the harem are very difficult to understand Anyhow, the device of introducing lovers to each other is novel and is certainly an improvement on the popular device of uniting them in dream or through a painting

The romantic interview and the curious separation are followed by the prince s efforts to win his love On his way to Śrāvastı, he stops to enjoy a cock fight which, apart from its scenic value for him gives him a shrewd accomplice in Pañcāla śarman an old rogue in his love adventure They play a clever game wherein the prince assumes the role of a daughter of some *brāhmana* whose part is ably played by Pañcalaśarman, the old schemer, he approaches the Śravastī king with the request that his daughter (who was in fact the prince !) may be kept secure in the harem till he brings back her suitor who has gone to Ujjayinī for higher studies, which the king grants But unable to give his daughter back to him when he comes with his son in law who is no other than the prince earlier disguised as his daughter, who had secretly left the harem and joined the *brah mana* the poor king has to give his own daughter, Navamalikā, instead for, the old knave stages a drama of attempting suicide in case his *deposit* is not returned The motif of impersonation and the incidents accompanying it have been skilfully presented

The success of the prince is partly due to the parallel efforts made by the other party the princess who despatches her messenger with the prince s portrait drawn by himself during his romantic stay in the harem The errand girl recognises him through the painting and duly gets his willing acceptance, so that the matter proceeds

7 *The story of Mitragupta* in the next *ucchvasa* (pp 149-72) appertains to his curious and heroic adventures in land and at sea The prince happens to join the *kanduka* festival of the Suhma princess Kandukavatī, in which she was ordained by the Goddess, Durgā to play with a ball (*kanduka*) and to select her husband from amongst the visitors He is happily chosen by the princess, though unluckily he becomes the object of the wrath of her brother, Bhīmadhanvan who was predestined by the same goddess to serve his sister s lord, and is seized and thrown into the sea by his men

Picked up by a passing vessel of the Yavanas, he fights valiantly for them against some pirates whom he captures along with their captain who is none other than Bhimadhanvan Now drifted away by a strong gale, his vessel reaches a forlorn island where he encounters a demon who would devour him if he did not answer his four questions He pleases the demon with his clever replies to his questions The devil, however, dies in a duel with another demon, in trying to rescue a damsel in his possession, leaving her, as it were for the prince, since the other fiend also meets his end in the combat [1] With the maiden who turns out to be Kandukavatī his destined bride he sets sail and arrives at Dāmalipta, the capital of Suhma where he is warmly received as the crown prince He is despatched for Campā to help its ruler against his foe, and the opportunity unites him with his friends

The tale is rich in varied incidents in the development of which chance plays a vital role It is a mere coincidence that the leader of the sea robbers vanquished by the prince turns out to be his enemy Bhīmadhanvan whom he now fetters with the same iron girdle with which he was bound by his men Again it is the play of chance which brings about his timely union with his beloved in the far off islet The difficult task of the princess abduction has been achieved by the introduction of the supernatural element in the form of the protean demon The mutual destruction of the fiends which reminds us of the similar fatal duel of Sunda and Upasunda in the *Mahābhārata* [1] is a device

1 Cp Ādi ch 211 19 also cp BKM III 1 61 6 KSS III 1 135-40

artificially contrived in order to accomplish an uninterrupted union of the lovers

The story contains an interesting episode in the tale of the romantic love of Kośadāsa and Candrasenā which runs parallel to and has been beautifully linked with the main story Kośadāsa's inordinate love for the courtesan which gets him the nickname *Vesadāsa* (a brothel's slave) and his intention to commit suicide in frustration that he cannot get his beloved, present a sharp contrast to the harlot's reluctance to part with her life or even her outer form for his sake

Another notable feature of the story consists in the introduction of adventures on high seas and far off islands of fear and wonder and beauty It lends a distinctly romantic charm to the setting of the story But what attracts us most is the clever emboxing of four interesting stories into the tale after the manner of the *Vetalapañcaviṃsati* for which device the author might have also derived a hint from the similar context of the dialogue between a *Yakṣa* and Yudhisthira in the *Mahabharata* [1] The tales which are otherwise not indispensable for the development of the main theme, are interesting not as episodes but as independent short stories The first two present in a curious manner two divergently opposite forms of female character, the first (pp 157–8) revealing its darkest aspect in Dhumini and the second (pp 159–63) the brightest one in the noble character of Gomini The other two stories interest us for their pointed reference to the importance of firm determination and cunningness for achieving success in life, through the tales respectively of Ratnavati (pp 164 6) nicknamed Nimbavati for her bitter temper, whose strong will power wins back her fretted husband and Kalahakaṇṭaka (pp 167–70) whose shrewdness succeeds in the hard task of seducing a faithful wife of another

The story however suffers from the serious defect of describing a number of attempts at suicide not well grounded and hence all foiled Tungadhanvan for being issueless Kośadāsa in despair that his love is not granted and Kandukāvatī on hearing

1 Cp BKM IX 2 19 ff XII 2, 1 ff KSS XII 8 32 MBhār Vana ch 313 28-121

his lover's throw into the sea make vain attempts to end their lives.

8. *The story of Mantragupta* in the seventh chapter (pp. 172-86) opens with another clever device of introducing lovers to each other. It brings through the superhuman medium of a weird ascetic and his attendant, a goblin, the Kalinga princess Kanakalekhā from her harem to a lonesome cemetery near Kalinganagara which the hero happens to visit in course of his wanderings in search of Rājavāhana. Mantragupta overpowers, as the writer would have it, the sorcerer and rescues the maiden and through the goblin's help enters her inner chamber where he lives secretly with her.

His next adventure relates to his successful efforts for effecting the release of the Kalinga king along with his daughter Kanakalekhā, his love, from the captivity of the Āndhra ruler who had taken them prisoners deceitfully with the intention of marrying Kanakalekhā. He gets the rumour spread that she is possessed by an evil spirit who is to be overpowered first to get her and disguised as an ascetic offers his help to the Āndhra king in driving away the spirit for him. The king is made to believe that with his body metamorphosed by taking bath in a lake with certain magical rites he would be able to combat the spirit and falls an easy prey to the trick and loses his life at the hands of the prince who himself emerges from the lake as the transformed king. The device which has been skilfully worked out with definite planning wins him, along with the princess, the vast kingdom of Āndhra and Kalinga countries. Coming to the aid of the Anga ruler, he meets Rājavāhana and other friends.

The motif of transformation of body occurs also in Upahāravarman's story where, however, fire instead of water consumes the king aspiring for it. There is a difference in motives also; while the king of Videha wanted to win his queen's heart by becoming handsome, the Āndhra lord takes the fatal risk to obtain a beauteous spouse despite the cautioning words of the prince himself — who can know what mischief an enemy may mean on getting an opportunity[1] which add to the poignancy

1. Cp. DKC p. 152: [illegible]

of effect of the trick The variety saves the tale from staleness of repetition

A striking feature of the story, however, is the brilliant *tour de force* in complete avoidance of labial sounds (*u ū, o, au p, ph b, bh* and *m*) by the narrator, because his lower lip has been bitten so fiercely by the passionate kisses of his beloved that he cannot pronounce them The motive for the literary feat has been happily conceived by the writer who has worked it out with great success in this considerably long narrative

9 *The story of Visruta*, in the eighth *ucchvāsa* (pp 186-210) relates to his successful efforts to recover the lost kingdom of Bhāskaravarman a minor son of Anantavarman, the Vidarbha ruler, now vanquished and killed by the king of Aśmaka First of all, Visruta contrives to kill Mitravarman the king of Mahismatī, who wanted to murder the boy his nephew, now living along with his mother, with him He next kills the Utkala ruler to whom Mitravarman had planned to give Mañju vadini the young prince s sister, in marriage, and usurps his kingdom Then, having spread a false rumour of the death of the boy he reproduces him from behind the Durgā image in a temple as the prince revived and destined by the goddess to rule the kingdom as her son and presents himself as his regent and gets Mañjuvādini as honorarium for his duty from the same deity He faces now no difficulty in overthrowing the Aśmaka ruler and getting back the lost kingdom As a king of Utkala he goes to Campā to help its ruler against his enemies and meets his friends there

Before the main narrative actually starts we meet with the episodic but elaborate tale of Anantavarman s fall It begins with the wise counsel given to him by his old minister Vasu rakṣita whose political advice proves to be too bitter a herbal mixture for him to drink up Instead he falls a willing victim to the ill motived harangue of Vihārabhadra whose curious arguments in favour of idle pleasures and against grave deliberations of veteran councillors represent as Wilson rightly observed 'the language of the profligate in all ages [1] The

1 Cp DKC (his ed) intro cp Kale s notes

frank derision of Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra* which has been quoted with sarcastic comments and the subtle presentation of weak points of ministers, priests and envoys add to the interest of the story The tale hereafter is one of deep political plots and intrigues which naturally result in chaos and confusion every where in the state and finally in a complete overthrow of king dom by the foe The fall of Anantavarman is inevitable for his lapses are serious and his failure to detect his enemy s con spiracy proves to be fatal for him who takes sincerely the ill advice of Candrapālita who demonstrates vices as virtues and debauchery as nobility of mind

The tale of Viśruta s adventure which has a realistic touch seems to be based on some historical events, contemporary or more probably of the immediate past, as pointed out by V V Mirashi [1] The ingenious spreading of false rumour, the clever use of poisoned garland the successful employment of fraud in the name of Durgā and before her image and the novel intro duction of dancers and jugglers and their amusing feats are some of the notable features of the story

The foregoing analysis of the plot of the romance makes it clear that the writer has carefully conceived it and has accom plished it with great success It is like a statue chiselled out by the artist with great diligence and fine artistic sense, every detail of which contributes to its form and beauty The writer had evidently a definite outline of the entire plot before he took it up and, therefore it flows, not like a river which forges its course according to natural conditions but like a canal the course of which is directed by the architect in strict accordance with the destination which it is to reach and we should bear in mind the fact while evaluating it

In order to develop smoothly the course of his story towards its predetermined end the writer has employed all possible means and devices of traditional story telling He frequently takes recourse to the use of coincidence which in real life also plays a vital role in shaping human destiny but its fre- quent occurrence does injure our sense of probability for

1 Cp ABORI XXVI p 31 also cp above pt I ch III

incidents do concur in life but not too often The author also utilises time and again the device of divine intervention in order to give his story a desired turn It should not mean that there is total want of naturalness in the development of plot In fact its course generally proceeds with natural flow a disturbance occurring only occasionally

A striking feature of his construction of plot is the romantic atmosphere of wonder and beauty accompanied by a chain of lively and curious incidents which permeates the whole narrative We move here in a strange world of magic and marvel where the supernatural joins hands with the natural

Although there is a conspicuous line of affinity in the different tales of adventures of the princes all of whom strive for, and finally attain each a vast realm and a beauteous spouse there is the charm of a variety of opportunities and diversity of means and devices employed by the young aspirants and the fact lends a distinct freshness of originality and variety to the different tales There is an element of suspense in varied incidents which sustains our curiosity and keeps our interest awakened In bringing about love marriages the device of recollection of relations in previous births introduction of lovers through a painting or in dream or in an interview induced by supernatural agency and finally the employment of all sorts of means whether fair or foul have been freely resorted to With regard to the attainment of kingdom also, all types of political stratagems have been unscrupulously employed The use of diverse elements in different tales lends multiplex colouring to the stories which otherwise would have been a series of monotonously similar tales In the arrangement of plot and subsidiary episodes too the writer shows distinct judgement He varies his tone and alters his form to suit different occasions and thereby achieves variety

THE PLOT *AVANTISUNDARĪKATHĀ*

Scope of the plot Since *Avantisundarīkathā* is available to us in incomplete form it is difficult to ascertain the course of movement and the denouement of its story Nor can we say how and how far the theme signified the name of the

romance, except that it related to the story of Avantisundarī and her lover Rājavāhana, which formed its central pivot, though it might have covered the entire plot of the *Daśakumāracarita* as is shown by the fact that it moves parallel, as far as it is available and its verse summary named *Avantisundarīkathāsāra* further carries the tale to the story of the Ten Princes. The view is supported by a statement to that effect in the metrical summary.[1] The extant portion of *Avantisundarīkathā* does not even touch the genuine part of the *Daśakumāracarita* of Daṇḍin, it hardly reaches the middle of the current *Pūrvapīṭhikā's* second *ucchvāsa* (p. 28) where Kālindī (Mandākinī in ASK) narrates her story to Mātaṅga. The metrical compendium advances as far as the part of third *ucchvāsa* of Daṇḍin's work where Upahāravarman begins his efforts to seduce Kalpasundarī.[2]

The question naturally arises why the writer has taken up the same narrative in his two romances. In paucity of evidence, it is not possible to give a final reply to this vexed question. It may be conjectured, however, that the writer meant to apply the graces of the prose *kāvya* style in deference to the contemporary literary traditions, after the model set by the works of Subandhu and Bāṇa to the comparatively easy and swift narrative of his earlier romance. He has overstrung the simpler theme with enormous descriptive material and with a long chain of episodic tales which have complicated the easy course of narrative and have hampered its swift movement. The writer might have achieved a great thing from the point of view of the contemporary literary ideal and standard, but in the opinion of modern critic the *Daśakumāracarita* is far more successful in

---

1. Cp. VIII. 3 [illegible] ।

2. If ASKS is held to be a uniformly proportionate summary, the volume of ASK covered by the extant ASKS would be estimated to be double the present size which ASKS summarises in 658 verses only out of the total of 1067 stanzas, and since ASKS covers only half the story of DKC, the entire bulk of ASK appears to have been four times bigger than the existing volume in case it covered the whole of DKC. The extant ASK despite a continuous chain of lacunae is almost double the volume of DKC, though its plot covers only the first 28 pages of spurious PP and is far behind the story of the authentic work of Daṇḍin.

regard to the development of plot than the *Avantisundarikatha* wherein the story proceeds at a snail's pace Descriptive and episodic material does occur in the *Daśakumaracarita* also, but there is proper limit In the *Avantisundarikathā*, however, these elements turn up in disproportionate length and detail and consequently often break the main thread of the tale The lengthy description of elephant troop and cavalry[1] and a number of episodes like those of Potapa and Kādambari which could easily be dispensed with amply illustrate this point

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE PLOT

As the general course of the narrative and also its main incidents are similar in the two romances, a separate study of the plot of *Avantisundarikathā* need not detain us here We would, however, make a comparative study of the plot in the two works and note only the points of divergence[2] which seem to have been caused mainly by the fact that the *Purvapiṭhika* which covers the entire plot of the extant *Avantisundarikathā* is not the genuine work of Danḍin, but is merely a patch up worked up by some late writer on the basis of its Telugu version [3]

The main point of discrepancy relates to the enumeration of princes, which in the *Avantisundarikatha* is as follows

1 Hamsavahana 2 Rājavāhana	< Rājahamsa the Magadha king			
3 Apaharavarman 4 Upahāravarman	< Prahāravarman, the Videha king			
5 Mitragupta 6 Arthapala	< Sumitra < Kāmapala	< *Dharmapala*	Ministers of Rājahamsa
7 Viśruta 8 Mantragupta 9 Puṣpodbhava	< Suśruta < Sumantra < Ratnodbhava	< Padmodbhava	Ministers of Rājahamsa
10 Devarakṣita 11 Pramati	< Satyaśarman < Sumati	< Matiśarman	Ministers of Rājahamsa

1 ASK pp 65-99 ASKS covers it in one verse (II 74) only
2 Cp K. S M Sastri ASK intro pp 10-21 for detail
3 Cp above pt I ch III for detail

12 *Somadatta* < *a priest of the king Rājahamsa*

But the scheme of the *Pūrvapīṭhikā* has the enumeration in the following way

1 Rājavāhana	< Rājahamsa the Magadha king		
2 Apahāravarman 3 Upahāravarman	< Prahāravarman the Videha king		
4 Mitragupta < Sumantra 5 Mantragupta < Sumitra 6 Arthapāla < Kāmapāla	< Dharmapāla	Ministers of Rājahamsa	
7 Viśruta < Suśruta 8 Puṣpodbhava < Ratnodbhava	< Padmodbhava		
9 Pramati < Sumati 10 Somadatta < Satyavarman	< Sitavarman		

It is clear that the *Avantisundarīkathā* refers in all to twelve *kumāras*. One of them, namely, Hamsavāhana disappears from the scene just at the outset, having been stolen away by a swan. His reappearance however, in the later part of the story is indicated at two places in the *kathā* itself[1]. The work includes the son of the royal priest also in the list whom it names Somadatta (who in the *Purvapīṭhikā* appears as the son of Satyavarman). Again, the *Purvapīṭhikā* is silent about Devarakṣita. According to the *Avantisundarīkathā*, during the quarter-conquest when on one morn, the princes find their leader missing they move to different directions in search of him and leave Devarakṣita behind to watch the spot. In the authentic *Daśakumāracarita* also Devarakṣita's position is obscure: he might have been absent in the work as the name of the romance takes upon itself to relate the account of *ten princes only*. There is discrepancy also in the detail of the acquisition of the princes in the two compositions.[2]

SOME NOTABLE FEATURES OF THE PLOT

A striking feature of the plot of the *Avantisundarīkathā* is

---

1 Cp ASK p 125 [illegible], p 220 [illegible]

2. Cp for detail K. S. M Sastri ASK Intro pp 10 21

its prologue which describes on the suggestion perhaps of Bana's *Harsacarita*, the curious origin of the story The author, after giving an autobiographical sketch tells us that he narrates the story of Avantisundari to his friends as an explanation of the mystery of a lotus changed into a *vidyādhara* at the touch of the image of Visnu on the sea shore which he visits at the instance of a famous architect to see his wonderful skill in un perceivably repairing the broken arm of the statue It appears from this that the tale concluded with the revelation of the mystery Some *vidyādhara* cursed for his fault connected with flowers to floral birth by some wrathful ascetic as the writer himself tells us might have been allowed by him on second consideration to resume his original form at the touch of the feet of Visnu A similar incident of the conversion of a silver chain into a nymph occurs in *Dasakumāracarita* which has been cleverly linked up with the story of Rājavāhana [1] But in the present case it is difficult to determine how the curious incident was connected with the story of Avantisundari or with that of her lover, Rājavahana The significance of this interesting prologue to the narrative and the measure of success in the development of its romantic possibilities could be properly assessed only when we were in possession of the entire work There is no doubt, however that the introduction and also the execution of the scheme are strikingly novel and original

Another special feature of the plot is the free inclusion of all sorts of episodic tales into its narrative though some of them are unwieldy and are preponderant upon the main stream of the story

Among the main episodes the story of Vindhyasenā her husband Vyāghradamana and the latter s father who had deve loped fast friendship with the king Rajahamsa during his stay in the Vindhya woods affords us a happy glimpse into the lively and cheerful life of sylvan people The incident of Rājavāhana s birth has been made to synchronise with that of Vindhyasenā s son Simhadamana [2]

1 Cp pp 59-61

2. ASK pp 15? 66 ASKS III 45-48

The episode of Potapa a merchant spoken of as contemporaneous with Maurya Chandragupta is also notable for its curious reference to Puspodbhava s ancestry [1] It was due to Potapa s noble spirit of charity that the king granted eighteen boons to the merchant community one of them namely immunity from death sentence in offences like theft has been referred to in the *Daśakumaracarita* also

The side tales of Vararuci Vyadi and Indradatta and their preceptor Upavarsa[3] occurs in course of the description of royal dynasties following the king Ripumjaya in the context of Mahāpadma Nanda (Kubera s son Padmanidhi reborn) who collected all gold of the land for himself Upavarsa s pupils approach him for gold to be offered to their preceptor as fee Mahāpadma Nanda instead of granting their request feels overjoyed over his having rendered the earth bereft of all gold and dies in a fit of rapture and returns to his father Kubera who however curses him for not having fulfilled Upavarsa s desire for gold, to be reborn as Potapa s son Padmodbhava the grand sire of Puspodbhava

The interesting episode of Samudradatta and Karniputra[4] occurs in order to explain the origin of Ratnodbhava his wife Suvratā and their son Puspodbhava Samudradatta and his wife who were originally two swans in the lake, Bindusaras were cursed to suffer a long separation by the sage Narada for having nibbled at the lotuses gathered by him for the worship of Visnu They were again born as Ratnodbhava and Suvratā their son Puspodbhava originally being Kubera s son Nalakubera, cursed to be born to them for having sympathised with them when they as swans provoked Nārada s anger Karniputra comes

1 ASK pp 175 8 ASKS IV 1-15

2 DKC p 89 also ASKS VIII 77 (broken)

3 ASK pp 179-85 ASKS IV 21 70 Mañju (c 8th cent) mentions Vararuci as a minister of Nanda KMIm V p 143) of c 900 refers to Varsa Upavarsa Vyadi and Vararuci as graduates from Pātaliputra university cp V S Agrawal PB pp 156 G H Sastri ASKS intro pp xiiff for Upavarsa cp V Raghavan SPr pp 750-2 also cp KSS 1.2 for these tales.

4 ASK pp 186-90 ASKS IV 75-100 also cp DKC pp 76 102 f f Karchuta cp for detail ASKS intro pp x-xi

into the picture as the seducer of Samudradatta's wife

The story of the recovery of Devarakṣita closely resembles that of Somadatta in the *Purvapiṭhika*[1]

In the tale of Arthapāla[2] the writer elaborates through Kubera as the narrator, the story of the identity of Śaunaka Śudraka and Kamapāla as also their wives, differentiated only by three successive births The adventures of Kāmapala in the above three births which have been beautifully described, engage our apt attention In the *Daśakumaracarita* only a passing reference is made to the elaborate scheme The introduction to the tale is similar in both the works Asked by Kubera about the nature of her mental disposition towards the child, Artha pala, when Tārāvalī replies that she feels affection for him as though he were born to her Kubera relates the narrative con nected with it[3]

The story of the horse, Bhadravahana, describes the origin of winged horses and the cutting off of their wings by the sage Śalihotra who, cursed for that reason by Indra to take birth as the breeding horse is born as Bhadravahana[4]

The story of Matanga[5] describes him in previous birth as Nityogra son of the minister of Vidarbha ruler The tale of his wife Mandakini is also interesting In *Purvapiṭhika* the episode is given quite differently

The story of Kādambarī[6] which closely resembles the tale in Bana s romance has been narrated in the work by the husband of Mahaśvetā referred to as a friend of Mandakinī wife of Matanga The *Avantisundarikatha* breaks off abruptly in the middle of the episode

---

1 Cp ASK pp 193-9 ASKS IV 113 ff DKC pp 19-21

2 ASK (lost) ASKS IV 161 for Śudraka in *kathā* literature M R Kavi ASK intro pp 7-8 C B Pande (*Śudraka* pp 1-38) identifies him with Gautamīputra Pulumāvi (c 130-55 A D) The story of love of Śaunaka and Bandhumatī is alluded to in the *Kaumudīmahotsava* (II 15 V 9) also

3 Cp DKC p 127 also cp pt I ch II

4 ASK pp 203-4 ASKS V 1-16 in MBhār (Vana ch 71 27) Śālihotra appears as a writer on veterinary science

5 ASK pp 238-41 ASKS V 50-65 cp PP pp 24-8

6 ASK pp 243-5 ASKS V 112-49

The course of the narrative after the sub tale is determined by its verse summary which presents to us the real form of the stories of adventures of Puṣpodbhava and Somadatta which we do not get in that form in the current *Purvapiṭhikā* In the scheme of the *Kathāsāra*, unlike that in the patchwork it is Puṣpod bhava who meets Rājavāhana first and narrates his tale, and then comes Somadatta There is discrepancy also in the detail of stories The incidents of Puṣpodbhava s successful encounter with the highwaymen who attacked a caravan of merchants and his forging friendship with one of its members and Bālacandrikā's futile attempt to commit suicide in protest of her parents decision to give her to Dāruṇavarman in marriage[1] are absent in the *Purvapiṭhikā* The rumour of her possession by some evil spirit occurs in both the works but the scheme followed in the *Kathāsāra* according to which the spirit would kill her suitor if he is not of the same caste and status,[2] is decidedly easier and better

A novel feature in Somadatta's story is that his meeting with Rājavāhana has been shown to have taken place when he was going in a palanquin to the temple of Mahākāla who had given Vāmalocanā as daughter to the king Vīraketu with the condition that her husband would die of a disease, if he did not worship him continuously for six months Since for not having offered his worship to the god till now, he was sick and was unable to pronounce the harsh sounds he narrates his tale in soft words composed of twenty four mellow letters only [3] The incident of his winning Vāmalocanā is differently narrated in the *Kathāsāra* wherein he kills one Prakaṇṭaka a friend of Māna pāla a minister s son (and not himself a minister as in the *Purvapiṭhikā*) for his trying to assault criminally Mānapāla s wife a friend of Vāmalocanā and boldly confesses his having done so in order to save Mānapāla who is suspected and is awarded death sentence Then follows his battle with the Lāṭa ruler, in which he aided by his friends kills his foe and wins Vāma

---

1 ASKS VI 51 ; for *Dāruṇavarman* we have *Dāru* in PP

2 Cp VI 69

3 That is first letters of 5 *vargas* 5 nasals 4 semivowels and 10 vowels leaving ṛ and ḷ (cp ASKS VII. 14) which constitute the Tamil alpha

locanā, the princess as reward

The story of Rajavāhana s marriage with Avantisundari too, has been presented in a better way At the instance of Puspodbhava Rajavahana draws from recollection a portrait of Yajñavati her beloved in former life which was to Puṣpod bhava s great surprise a replica of Avantisundari Balacandrika takes the painting to the princess who also draws from memory *a picture of Samba, her lover in previous birth, which resembled* the prince The motif as a device for introducing lovers to each other is absent in the *Purvapiṭhikā* It is after this introduction that Rājavāhana relates the tale of love of Samba and Yajñavati[1] when he finds Bālacandrika trying to capture the swan passing by the princess This event has been given in the *Purvapiṭhika* as *revoking retrospection of former life by the lovers* Also the prince s first meeting with the magician who brings about his marriage with the princess has been described in a better way in the metrical summary The juggler dejected by the depravity of kings is about to commit suicide when the prince sees him and comes to know that he is the same man as had saved the life of Puṣpodbhava s mother in Kalinga forest This ingenious linking up of the incidents which is absent in the *Purvapiṭhikā* explains the magician s eager willingness to help the prince in his venture[2] With regard to the incident of Rajavahana s secret stay with the princess there is no material difference save that there is no mention of the cage in the summary wherein only the metal chain which turns into a nymph has been referred to

The tale of Apahāravarman s bold adventures closely re sembles both in characters and incidents that given in the *Dasakumaracarita* the familiar figures of Marici, Virupaka and Vimardaka and of Kamamañjari and Rāgamañjari appear with their usual problems and solutions Certain points of affinity deserve particular notice as for instance the description of the

---

bet with the exception of *l*r and *r* Does it imply a derogatory reference to the language and its speakers ?

1 ASKS VI 90 ff

2. ASKS VII 1 ff

3 ASKS VII 44-75

duties and rights of a harlot's mother, the definition of wealth and pleasure the sad tale of Virūpaka and the depiction of the scene of gamble,[1] besides a large number of strikingly similar phrases[2] There is close similarity in the extant portion of Upahāravarman s story also in the middle of which the *Kathāsāra* breaks off

From the above points of affinity it seems to be evident that the author in his *Avantisundarīkathā* closely followed the course of the narrative of the *Daśakumāracarita* though he proceeded with the tale in a leisurely manner, like a curious wanderer casting his eyes on all sides and gathering all kinds of material which he may choose to pick up

CHARACTERISATION

Characterisation in Daṇḍin occupies only a secondary position, it is superseded either by the narration of incidents or by the elaboration of descriptive and episodic material or even by both There is no great scope left for a constant and con sistent development or a deep analysis of a character in the scheme and framework of Daṇḍin s romances It should not however mean that he is not at home in the matter of delineating characters In fact he commands a unique power of vivid characterisation He realistically creates and artistically develops and shapes a character when he means to do so Most of his characters, which are made of the stuff of the real world, are the creation of his close observation of life and people, and, though their delineation is sometimes heightened or exaggerated they are as a rule life like and true The realistic element in them never supersedes the artistic one and it should be noted that the writer is realistic not in the sense that he is unnecessarily precise in trifles but in the sense that he is faithful to his charac ters He is especially adept in the art of forging caricatures which draw our attention more than anything else in his romances

1 Cp ASKS VIII 9 19 27 8 35–43 and 41–4 with DKC pp 65–8 70–1, 73 5 and 75–7 respectively for above descriptions
2. Cp Apx V

His range of characterisation is vast enough to cover a long gallery of portraits of varied types and individuals including men and women from all walks of life as also from every stratum of the society He vividly portrays, for instance, venturesome and intriguing kings gallant princes, loyal and wise counsellors, corrupt officials, negligent policemen, crafty and obsequious favourites, sweet tongued parasites, spoiled *kulaputras*, dexterous magicians, rich and poor merchants fraudulent ascetics, licentious men about town shrewd gamblers expert thieves and roguish *brahmanas* among men And among women he delineates unfaithful and cruel queens impetuous princesses with their clever and daring friends and attendants audacious maidens approaching their lovers at night stone hearted wives like Dhūmini and virtuous ladies like Gominī, greedy and heartless whores and bawds as also simple and affectionate courtesans and cunning nuns acting as go betweens Daṇḍin's women characters are bolder than his men whom they surpass at times in point of audacity wickedness and cruelty Some of his female figures are so daring and viraginous that it may be difficult to find their originals in the real world

The writer is not content with enlivening the more important figures only, but he takes an equally keen interest in bestowing life on minor characters also It must be admitted here that he feels at home more with bad characters than with good ones Such characters belonging either to a degenerated society or to a degenerated stratum of society are mostly *dhiroddhata* (brave ond haughty) or *dhiralalita* (reckless and sportive) characters[1] at their best *Dhirodatta* (brave and noble minded) or *dhiraprasānta* (firm and calm) figures appear very rarely in his works Even Rajavāhana the chief figure of his romances cannot be called a noble and calm hero though he may be slightly better than others in manners and behaviour The *Daśakumaracarita* is justly called a romance of rogues and in this respect it is comparable to the *Mṛcchakaṭika* which, however has got a quiet hero to its credit and to the four

1 Cp for definition of these heroes DR II 1 ff, SD III 31-8 Keith SDr pp 305 ff

bhāṇas which vividly depict low characters and clever tricksters [1]

For evident reasons, there is an intrinsic affinity of habits and manners in the characters of Daṇḍin and particularly in the ten princes who possess the same physical and mental accomplishments, the same guiding principles of conduct and morality and above all the same attitude towards life and people And had they all faced similar circumstances and environments, they would have acted almost in an identical way As such they appear to be ten different manifestations of one single character, observed from ten different angles in the form of ten different circles conditions and surroundings There is no scope left, nor any effort made, for a distinct development of their individual personality, which is demanded of an artist today It is unfair however, to produce the classical writer in the literary court of a modern critic Judged from the standard of the age in which Daṇḍin lived and wrote, he is remarkably successful in investing his characters with life and reality, and he fares far better than others in the field

MALE CHARACTERS

Among the male characters first come the ten princes of the *Daśakumāracarita*, who are all ambitious and enterprising young men of stout and charming physique They have a fancy for love and beauty to achieve which they are prepared to take any risk they are called upon to do In sharp contrast to the common folk, they command protuberant character by virtue of which they win instantaneous fame and glory wherever they go They are ever ready to help the oppressed and still more so to do away with the oppressor Their behaviour is generally courteous but when an occasion demands they turn haughty and rude and even furious They believe in the theory that end justifies means and that all is fair in love and war Nevertheless they have or rather pretend to have faith in God religion and morality, and justify their deeds however sinful, on moral grounds In other words they are out to do anything good or bad under the protective covering of the name of God and

1 Cp for Mṛcch and the four Bhāṇas De HSL pp 239-55

religion

All of them love and cultivate art, including fine arts like music and painting as well as those of crooked nature like thieving and gambling in which, as the *Purvapiṭhikā* tells us, they received education from different teachers [1] There is a commixture of constructive and destructive elements in all of them who destroy one thing to create another They are all endowed with worldly wisdom which often borders on shrewdness They unscrupulously regard ingenuity as a supreme means of achieving success in life The qualities of talent and spirit have often been mentioned by or with reference to, them [2] All the princes are cosmopolitan in spirit and character, they are free from local prejudices and are quite at home at any place or country [3] They choose cosmopolitan cities of the time as fields to make their fortunes in According to Indian tradition, these princes fall in the class of *dhīroddhata* (brave and haughty) heroes with an amorous tinge in their characters

Rajavahana s character, though very similar to that of his other associates stands out in certain respects as unique in the row of the princes His majestic and stately appearance his sprout like hands marked with linear signs of a lotus and a wheel indicative of his sovereignty, and his voice deep like the thunder of a train of clouds have been particularly referred to by the writer[4] who even makes once the hero to speak in praise of himself [5]

A self respecting youth, he does not indulge in serious crimes though he would tacitly allow them when committed by his friends to achieve their ends, of course with some reservations He naturally regards Upahāravarman s act of adultery as fraud but justifies it as a proper means of achieving his object He pays compliments to the wisdom of his friends though he knows that it is strictly synonymous with the art of

1 Cp DKC (PP) pp 21-2

2 Cp DKC pp 80 109 123 186

3 Cp esp DKC p 80 स्वदेशो देशान्तरम इति नेय गणना विदग्धस्य पुरुषस्य ।

4 Cp DKC pp 56 57 61 102

5 Cp DKC p 62

bluffing Although endowed with youthful prowess and spirit, he, like his companions believes in fate and meekly submits to its dictates [1]

He is a man of venturesome spirit, eager to take any risk to help the supplicant He commendably assists Mātanga in his difficult mission, caring the least for himself or for his com panions He is sober and serious, but at the same time he is possessed of a subtle sense of wit and humour, as his sprightly remarks on the adventures of his friends indicate [2]

Apahāravarman presents, among the princes a much bolder and stiffer character and he has rightly been described by Rājavāhana as having surpassed even Karṇisuta the traditional propounder of the art of stealing, in hardihood,[3] for he is speci ally adept in the notorious art and follows it as serious profes- sion He gives an ingenious explanation for his sinful act that by robbing the niggard of their money, he restores them to normal state of mind by proving to them the transitoriness of wealth He plunders the rich misers of the city to the extent of making them to beg for alms at the houses of their previous supplicants now enriched by him with their wealth Burglary forms a part of his habit Having constructed for Kāntaka an underground passage up to the harem he thinks that the great labour will go in vain if he returns without stealing something from the maiden s apartment though at the sight of the princess he forgets to rob and is robbed instead of his own heart His name though given to him on account of his having been stolen away after birth aptly signifies his burglarious nature He is so perfect in the art that he enters another s house for theft as if it were his own In drunkenness he follows this very wonted practice of his and in the height of intoxication even declares to rob the whole city of its wealth in a single night Dhanamitra s following words of thanks addressed to him his benefactor are significant though he utters them innocently of

---

1 Cp. DKC pp 31 37 171

2 Cp. op p 11' his remarks on Mātanga s adventures विरम इह [illegible]

3 Cp. DKC p 10'

the side meaning they convey 'you have given me my beloved, but have robbed me of my words '[1] Even his act of benefaction is not unmixed with an element of theft ! His character resembles in this respect the trained burglar Śarvilaka of the *Mṛcchakaṭika*

Related closely to the art of burglary is his great skill in digging tunnels in which art he compares favourably with the sons of Sagara who dug the earth down to the nether land in search of their sacrificial horse [2] He is also adept in the art of gambling in no time he wins sixteen thousand *dīnāras* by dint of his full acquaintance with various tricks of the game

He excels other princes in the matter of intriguing also He plots against the tyrants to help those in distress His conspiracy victimises the harlot Kāmamañjari, the merchant Arthapati Kāntaka the jailor and the king Caṇḍavarman, while Kulapālikā a merchant s daughter, the ugly Virupaka and the bounteous Dhanamitra as also a host of others receive his kind benevolence His venturesome spirit is amply reflected in the following advice he gives to Dhanamitra who wants to run away from the inimical society Staying in one s own country or in a foreign place is no consideration with a man of talent , an abandonment of the native place through fear bespeaks some thing like want of talent and spirit on one s part '[3]

Like his other friends he has a weakness for women and beauty Just at the sight of the courtesan Rāgamañjarī dancing on the stage, his mind becomes, as he himself observes, a second stage for her dance Again the sight of the princess Ambālikā enkindles in his heart an instantaneous passion of love for her Obviously his love is physical without a spiritual tinge his words addressed to Ambalika in painting imploring her to sleep with him fully exhausted in amorous sport[4] amply betoken his lust

His attitude towards life is light and hedonistic He believes in the present rather than in the past or future To

1 DKC p 79 दत्त्वैवेयम मस्या निनि प्रिया म दत्ता वाक्पुनर्ममापहृता ।
2. DKC p 97, cp Rām. I 38-44
3 DKC p 80 ASKS VIII 53
4 Cp DKC p 99 also cp ASKS VIII 98

him, no sin is more heinous than the abandonment of the self or the act of committing suicide In the episode of the magic purse, he sermonises Dhanamitra to rise by personal efforts without destroying the self Characteristic of his peculiar attitude is his argument that there are many means of making money but no means of making life by patching a severed throat.[1]

He is endowed with a unique gift of presence of mind and ready wit Things flash upon his mind at once to solve even the most vexed problems When Dhanamitra tells him that Rāgamañjarī would sell her youth only for merits and not for money, while her greedy mother must not agree without wealth, he summarily gives the solution that both of them should be won over, the former by virtues and the latter by secret offers of money[2] His presence of mind never fails him however in great distress or danger he may be When moving with Kulapālikā at night he is detected by the city guards he feigns to be bitten by a snake and escapes arrest When caught red handed killing policemen in over-excitement he saves Dhanamitra and Rāgamañjarī by forging things indicative of his enmity with them and again he escapes imprisonment when besieged by sentinels while coming out of the harem he pretends to be and acts like, a lunatic

He is also possessed by a false sense of morality While killing Kāntaka he consoles his guilty conscience that he will not incur the sin of proving false to his promise, even if he strikes him down because the man has taken a false oath to liberate him To him counterfraud is no fraud and thus he is happy that he is not untrue

The writer has very carefully unfolded the character of Apahāravarman who has rightly been called the Indian Robin Hood 'who plunders the rich to pay the poor unites lovers and reinstates unfortunate victims of meanness and treachery '[3]

Upahāravarman another budding youth endowed with

---

1 Cp. DKC p 82
2 Cp DKC p 85 ASKS VIII 63
3 Cp De HSL p 211-2

charming personality talent, grace and knowledge and wisdom,[1] is an equally bold intriguer who succeeds in seducing the queen, Kalpasundari by his fraudulent tricks

Like his elder brother he has a lust for beauty which makes him to stoop to the degraded act of adultery He yields to the passion of love quite helplessly[2] and implores the queen to revive him with side long glances as with curing herbs He cannot wait even for the completion of his plot and indulges with the queen much before it is realised His character exemplifies the maxim that a good end justifies even bad means In order to get his parents released and to recover his father s lost king dom, he takes recourse to committing fraud and adultery, fully alive at the same time to his sense of duty and morality ! He sets before himself the example of moon god for the immoral act *for which he also gets a forged license from the scripture-*writers He even muses that his motive of liberating his parents would not only extenuate the sin but also produce some reli gious merit ! Still more interesting is his dream in which the god Ganeśa finally sets aside his fear as to what his companions on knowing all this would think of him The dream comes true when the chief hero gives his approval to the act, adding that everything becomes commendable when it is done by the wise His clever hypocrisy is further noticed in his pretending to uphold the cause of righteousness by not accepting a precious jewel for a very small price[3]

His presence of mind and sense of humour even in serious moments which exhibit his merry and carefree disposition to wards life are notable His words addressed to the king to be transformed who foolishly takes them to be his own wife s ably display his mental wakefulness and light temper 'What need is there of an oath ? What woman on earth will dare offend me ? If you unite with the nymphs do as you wish Now tell me your secrets and then your natural form will disappear '[4]

1 Cp esp his nurse s remarks regarding him (DKC p 108)
2 Cp his words (DKC p 116) अयि मुग्धे, क सचेतन स्त्रियम् अभिकाम यमानां नाभिनन्दति ?
3 DKC p 122
4 DKC p 120

And verily does the poor king lose his *natural form* to unite with the nymphs in heaven [1]

On the whole he is a hardened sinner who sagaciously explains his sins as virtues and wishfully defends his criminal deeds on moral grounds

Arthapāla's character also is an assemblage of the qualities of physical strength wisdom and gallantry This device of the snake bite displays his subtle presence of mind and resourcefulness He could save his father's life by a heroic act also, but he deliberately avoids it lest somebody from amongst the crowd should frustrate his efforts by striking down his father He is skilled in the employment of spells and herbs and his knowledge of toxicology enables him to arrest the movement of the venom in his father's body and finally to cure him of it He is also perfect in the art of digging tunnels, which affords him duplex achievement he captures his enemy and also gets Maṇikarṇikā into the bargain The daring act of entering into the inner chamber of the king manifests his audacity and bravery, and Rājavāhana rightly commends his special qualities of valour and wisdom [2]

Pramati, significantly named as such succeeds, by virtue of his excellent wisdom in making his fortune as the son in law of the king of Śrāvastī without bloodshed He gets an accomplice in equally sagacious Pāñcālaśarman with whose help he plays the trick of impersonation Rājavāhana very aptly describes his adventure as refined by graceful sports and softened by gentleness and consequently appealing to the learned taste [3]

He is a cautious lover Before developing a fancy for Navamālikā he first ascertains that she is not a nymph nor is a married lady Again he does not forget to know his beloved's mind before he proceeds with the matter We may not however subscribe to his claim that he never entertains a thought unworthy of an honourable man [3] *for we see him overstepping* the limits of propriety in infiltrating into the maiden's apartments by fraudulent impersonation Even in his first meeting

1 DKC p. 137
2. DKC p. 148
3. DKC p. 149

with the princess he expressly confesses his inability to subdue his passions

Although he tacitly believes in the role of fate in life, he firmly relies on strong determination and sustained perseverance by virtue of which he attains success

Mitragupta s character presents a unique combination of handsome form physical strength manliness and sharp intelli gence His charming personality wins him the love of the prin cess Kandukāvatī whose fresh youth fills his heart also with fond affection for her

We observe his bravery and venturesome spirit to which Rājavāhana pays a glowing tribute, in his struggling against death by floating about on the sea for the whole day and night and in defeating Bhimadhanvan in a tough sea fight But he knows occasions in an encounter with the *Brahmarakṣasa* he puts side his valour and employs, instead his wisdom and wins him over by the clever replies he gives to his four questions He also wisely keeps away from the duel of the demons whom he happily survives to enjoy the booty left by them !

His general attitude towards life is realistic but optimistic According to him nothing succeeds like success and cunningness aided by persistence is the only way to it [1] He also commands a subtle sense of humour a typical example of which we find in his joke at the cost of the unsacrificing whore Candrasenā He suggests her to use a certain collyrium which makes one look like a female ape in order to avoid the unwelcome love of the prince !

Mantragupta s character also impresses us with pre emi *nent spirit of adventure and heroism* When occasion demands, he readily exercises his prudence and also resorts to fraudulent means He strategically plots against the Āndhra king and playing the trick of impersonation kills him and usurps his kingdom He can incur a risk in order to save one in trouble He rescues, from the clutches of a cruel ascetic, the innocent maiden Kanakalekhā and behaves with her in a decent manner though subsequently he yields to her wantonness and audacity

1 Cp DKC pp 156 ff esp क काम , सकल्प , किं दुष्करसाधन, प्रज्ञा ।

He believes in an ambitious and energetic life for according to him, fortune does not favour one who is inactive and is a pessimist[1] There is a combination of prowess and prudence in him The chief hero rightly discerns in his character the true form of ingenuity and courage culminating in happy success[2]

Vidruta's character also is figured with the lines of mental and physical faculties His fertile intellect invents the trick of the poisoned garland and of the false rumour of divine bestowal of favour on Bhāskaravarman while his venturesome spirit displays itself in his playfully murdering the king Pracaṇḍavarman Of course he benefits others but at the same time he cannot forget his self interest While doing good to the minor prince by declaring Durgā's favour on him he manoeuvres to get his sister in marriage as given by the goddess as remuneration in advance for looking after the young prince

Less carefully developed are the characters of Somadatta and Puṣpodbhava who appear in the *Purvapīṭhikā* Their character closely follows that of the other princes almost in every respect Among the minor figures in the *Daśakumāracarita*, the magician *Vidyeśvara* (pp 51 ff) is adept in his art he skilfully performs the nuptial ceremony of Rājavāhana with the princess under the pretext of his magic show *Caṇḍavarman* (pp 38 56 ff), the officiating king of Avanti suffers from a false sense of pride He arrogates himself as a man lion and attacks the Aṅga ruler for his refusal to give his daughter in marriage to him The character of the merchant *Dhanamitra* (pp 78 ff) who owing to his extravagant liberality purchases utter poverty for his riches from his supplicants undergoes a wholesale change under the influence of the trained offender in Apahāravarman who appropriates him to the extent that his introducing him to Rājavāhana as his own self only concealed under a different name and form[3] comes true by his subsequent actions The

1 Cp DKC p 181 (the view however is expressed by him [illegible] in order to entrap him into his meshes)
2 DKC p 156 [illegible]
3 DKC p 63 [illegible]

character of the sage, *Marıcı* (pp 64 ff), who ın his effort to mend the crafty harlot himself goes astray and falls an innocent victim to her cunning fabrication is a wonderful creation of the writer His ignorance of wealth (*artha*) and pleasure (*kama*) and a keen curiosity to know of them is interesting but still more interesting is his tragic knowledge of them The greatest irony of his being befooled is that though possessed of divine sight for others, he is quite unaware of his own fate at the hands of the courtesan Kāmamañjarı s cruel words, "you have very kindly favoured me, now please mind your pious duties [1] come to him as a thunderbolt

Equally interesting is the character of *Vasupalıta* (pp 74 ff), an ugly but wealthy youth, who pays a high price for his being rich He tries to make a virtue of the necessity of being bereft of all his possessions by turning a Jain monk, but as his conversion was uninspired, he is unable to put up with the terrible tortures of the Order and ultimately has to make a helpless retreat The gamester *Vımardaka* (pp 77 ff) comes in the picture only casually, but his feigned quarrel with Dhanamitra which entangles the innocent Arthapati, makes him an interesting figure The jailor *Kāntaka* (pp 92 ff) is very ably characterised as an arrogant youth who considers himself to be highly fortunate and handsome He is an inexpert lover who, deluded into the belief that the princess loves him treasures the nurse s soiled garments as a token of affection from her The poor fellow falls an easy prey to the overpowering shrewdness of Apaharavarman The Mithila ruler *Vıkaṭavarman* (pp 103 ff) is a reckless and impatient king who, in his eagerness to attain a beauteous form discloses his secret policies to Upahāravarman and meets his tragic end at his hand *Purnabhadra* (pp 124 ff) is a brave and valiant burglar who vehemently dashes against a furious elephant and knocks it back His attempt to commit suicide however, is unworthy of his heroic spirit The character of *Kamapala* the father of Arthapāla, *presents a rare* example of valour, daringness and gallantry

---

1 DKC p 72 चिरम अनुगृहीतोऽस्य दासजन । स्वधर्म इदानीम अनुष्ठेय ।
cp ASKS VIII 31

The old *brahmana*, *Pañcālaśarman* (pp 143 ff) is a confirmed rogue and a polished intriguer He takes an active part in the difficult task of winning for Pramati his beloved and remarkably improves upon his instructions Pramati rightly calls him a great ring leader [1] *Kośadasa* (pp 149 ff) a spoiled son of a great merchant, is nicknamed *Veśadasa* owing to his excessive attachment to the harlot Candrasenā He is a timid but sincere lover who wants to end his life in despair that he cannot get his beloved who, however is most reluctant to die for him *Śakti kumāra* (pp 159 ff) a merchant s son who makes a curious venture to get a life companion though proves to be a good examiner of a housewife s virtues, himself fails miserably in his duties towards his wife

The delineation of the character of the king *Anantavarman* presents a deeper note He casts aside his old and loyal minister because he thinks his sermon is too bitter for his taste instead, he relishes the ill motived and fatal advice of an agent of his foe and meets his end *Vihārabhadra* (pp 190 ff) who very cleverly rubs out the wise counsel of the veteran minister to the king by his shrewd arguments in favour of indolence and sensualism and against the solemn duties of a king has rightly been called a profligate of his time [2] The character of *Candrapālita* also who succeeds in detracting the new king by manipulating vices as virtues and sins as merits presents a similar form

We come across some interesting figures in the *Avantisun darīkathā* also Among them *Potapa* (pp 176 ff) is a liberal and noble minded merchant He expresses his gratitude to a cosurtesan who once saved his life by making her a gift of precious pearl necklace at the cost of the displeasure of the king Candragupta When asked to explain the gift he remarks that the present is little as compared with the good she did him by saving his life [3] When he casually tells the king how once he gave all he had to a needy man the king recognises him for he himself was *the needy man* and as a token of his gratefulness to him grants his

---

1 Cp DKC p 143 षड्विटानाम् धूर्तो ।
2 Cp Wilson quoted above
3 Cp ASK p 117 दत्तमिदं प्राणस्य मौल्यमल्पम् । ASAS IV 10

community eighteen boons *Indradatta* (pp 180 ff) studies the Vedic lore in order to win his beloved who was conditioned to be given in marriage to a man versed in Brahmic learning *Upavarsa* (pp 182 ff) the younger brother of Varsa a great scholar, makes his first appearance as a blockhead who falls an innocent victim to the shrewdness of his brother's wife She makes him to play the role of a fool in a ceremony called *murkhavrata*[1] Finally he comes as a great scholar He wins the sobriquet of *Krtakoti* for his refusal when offered a crore (*koti*) of gold coins to accept more than what he actually needed *Karniputra* (pp 187 ff) presents the character of a hardened sinner who believes in repaying an offence in the same coin or rather in a bigger one He tactfully abducts the wife of Samudradatta, his own friend, in order to retaliate his (Samudrdatta s) developing illicit relations with his courtesan wife Not only this much he even recriminates his friend and gets him banished from the country He belongs both in conduct and spirit to the category of the ten princes of the *Dasakumāracarita* and especially resembles the character of Apahāravarman who on his part regards him as his *guru*[1]

FEMALE CHARACTERS

Female characters of Daṇḍin present a far more interesting study from many points of view Like his male figures his women characters embrace almost all the spheres of life but what strikes us most is the rare and Amazonian boldness which we notice in most of them Highly voluptuous and lustful they often transgress the limits of decency and even surpass the sterner sex in frankness and hardihood though there are exceptions

Among the prominent female figures of the *Daśakumara carita Balacandrika* (pp 37 ff) the love of Puṣpodbhava appears first as a shy girl who conveys her passion for him through meaningful side-glances standing midway between love and bashfulness[2] But her coyness and diffidence vanish when her

---

1 DKC p. 76

2 DKC (PP) pp 37-8

love is duly reciprocated and subsequently she takes an active part in her lover's plot to murder his rival Dāruvarman

Avantisundarī (pp 43 ff) the beauteous damsel of Avanti and spouse of Rājavāhana the chief hero possesses womanly virtues like modesty and bashfulness though she forgets them in the intensity of passion and stoops even to indelicacy which we observe, for instance in the following words addressed by her to her lover 'I too possess power in some matters for without my will you cannot taste my kiss or clasp me to your bosom'[1] And especially noticeable is the initiative she takes in the amorous play with her lover[2]

Kāmamañjarī (pp 65 ff) the prominent courtesan of Campā is like Keats' *La Belle Dame Sans Merci* expert in the art of alluring and duping innocent men Marīci's tragic plight caused by her cunning intrigue loudly proclaims her unfeeling nature She beguiles the poor ascetic in order to gain her selfish and sordid end Her deceitful nature is amply reflected in her clever fabrication of arguments in favour of duty (*dharma*) Her parting words to the sage, though seemingly courteous savour of her bitter heart 'Revered Sir here I fold my hands to you this your servant has long been favoured now please return to your pious duties'[3] When asked the reason for this sudden indifference she explains to the sage that some damsel had challenged her with a wager to win over him and that by his *graceful favour* she has won the wager She loves money more than anything else in the world and is significantly nick named *Lobhamañjarī* True to her professional greed she chooses Vasupālita the mis shapen but wealthy youth in preference to a *handsome but poor man* and *heartlessly leaves him a pauper* in a few days But her excessive greed subsequently ruins her with the false hope of milking the magic purse she reduces her large fortune to the residue of a hearth Her sister *Rāga mañjarī (pp 83 ff) on the other hand presents quite an opposite* character She commands a noble and generous heart that goes

1 DKC p 55
2 Her character in the ASK is lost ASKS (VI 72 ff however has it
3 DKC p 72

contrary to her avocational traditions She cares for merits and not for money and wishes to follow the unfailing course of life of a woman of family

Kulapalikā (pp 78 ff) the beloved of Dhanamitra proves to be bolder than her passive lover in the matter of love She leaves her father s home in protest against his intention not to give her in marriage to her fianced lover whom she now daringly approaches at night *Śṛgalikā* (pp 90 ff), the nurse of Rāga mañjari, is a cunning bawd expert in the art of sensing difficult gestures and hints She forges intimacy between her mistress and the princess Ambālikā and befools Kāntaka into believing that the princess loves him, in order to clear the way for Apa haravarman s release and his illegal ingress into the harem She steals away things from the princess apartment and gives them to Kāntaka as gifts from his beloved She jogs the innocent jailor down to death by suggesting him means apparently safe but fatal in consequence Apahāravarman pays a befitting tri bute to her tactfulness when after issuing her necessary instruc tions he adds that what he says is but nothing and that her own policy will do better [1]

Kalpasundarī (pp 106 ff) the young and beauteous queen of Vikaṭavarman is an imposing and commanding lady who is weary of her ugly and discourteous husband Upahāravarman s handsome form seduces her to the extent that she joins him, as an accomplice in his treacherous plot on her own husband s life Her impudicity makes her to yield to her carnal desire even before the plot is carried through and her part in the act is by no means passive On another occasion she even surpasses her lover in impetuosity when she actively gives him her voluptuous embrace and passionate kisses A false sense of morality occupies her mind when she consoles her guilty con science that she has already been given to him in the presence of fire of love by Cupid officiating as her father and that she is once again being given over to him by her heart before *the holy fire* The fire which she refers to as a witness to their union is that which consumes her husband ! Her meanness and cruelty make

1 Cp DKC p 96 यदुक्तम् अल्पम्, त्वन्नय एवात्र भूयान् ।

her one of the most daring and audacious women among the female figures

Navamālikā (pp 146 ff) the princess of Śrāvasti also is a love sick maiden who develops a fancy for Pramati whose first sight fills her heart with the feelings of alarm, wonder joy, passion and fear and gaiety and feminine wish to charm '[1] Though modest by nature she displays her boldness inasmuch as she is too restless to keep waiting for her lover to come and meet her She despatches her messenger in search of her love and finally facilitates his entry into the inner apartments *Kandu kāvati* (pp 149 ff), the Suhma princess is an affectionate and tender hearted maiden Her friend *Candrasenā* (pp 149 ff) however, presents the character of a daring lady She is a courtesan to whom life is dearer than anything else in the world While her lover is out to die for her she does not entertain the idea of even losing her outer form for him When suggested by Mitragupta to use a certain ointment which makes one look like an ape in order to evade the sinister eye of an undesired lover, she vehemently retorts that she would be the last woman to get her face converted into an ape s[2] She is frank enough to admit her inability to end her life even if her love dies for her She beseeches him not to take the rash step for she argues if she survives him as she knows she would the scandal that the cour tesan class as a whole is wicked will get confirmation[3]

The character of *Dhūmini* (pp 157 ff) singularly illustrates the cruelty of a woman s heart Her wickedness goes to the extent that she knocks down her benevolent husband into a well and elopes with an ugly and crippled man Again when by a queer trick of chance she meets her husband still alive she tries to get him hanged by the king on the forged charge that he had disabled her *husband' Gomini's* character (pp 159 ff) on the other hand presents a nobler form of a woman s heart A sweet loyal and virtuous lady, she worships her husband as a deity and treats her courtesan co wife as her loving friend

1 DKC p 140
2 DKC pp 153-54
3 DKC p 150

Kanakalekhā (pp 173 ff) the Kalinga princess, is one of the boldest characters of Daṇḍin She is frank enough to proffer her love to Mantragupta, her rescuer, who of course accepts her offer She also gets him smuggled into her apartment in order to enjoy his company

The above survey of the female figures evidences the fact that they are most of them, bold and bare faced characters some of them even surpassing the male figures in many respects Generally they are more lustful than men Not only do they give a lead in candidly expressing their passion of love to their paramours but also play an active role in love sport They stoop to any type of brutal meanness in order to quench their passion Womanly virtues like modesty, delicacy and affection and compassion are absent in most of them and instead the harsher elements of cruelty selfishness greed and disloyalty vitiate their hearts The peculiar characterisation of women figures in Daṇḍin is accounted for by his antagonistic attitude towards the female sex According to him women are generally crooked and are heartless by nature [1] they are the source of shrewd stratagems and when tormented by sex instinct, they cannot bear the misery of the company of a man they hate [2] On the other hand he admits the characteristic weakness of men for them [3]

According to the traditional classification[4] most of the female figures of Daṇḍin are either *parakīyās* or *ganikās* (common women) popularly known as courtesans only a few of them being, strictly speaking, the *svakīyās* (legally married wives) The *parakīyas* are either married wives of others or more generally virgins From the standpoint of nature and behaviour, most of them fall in the class of *pragalbhās* (bold and confident ladies) who have been described as passionate women of vehement youth skilled in erotic science and bold in amorous play There may be a few *madhyamas* (ladies in middle of their youth)

1 ASK p 200 DKC p 156
2 DKC pp 105–10
3 DKC p 116 cp above
4 Cp for elaborate classification DR II 14 ff SD III 56–130 cp Keith SDr pp 308 ff

but there is hardly a *mugdhā* (innocent and artless lady) The *pragalbhās* again are mostly proud and impatient ladies Besides, there are a few others who may be classed as *abhisarikās*, the women going to a rendezvous to meet their lovers or *dutis*, the female go betweens The *dūtis* are either friends or slaves or nurses or nuns

DELINEATION OF *RASA* OR SENTIMENT

As in most of the Sanskrit poets, so in Daṇḍin, we find perfection mainly of the erotic and heroic sentiments The writer very ably delineates the two *rasas* on the traditional lines We notice in him a fine development of the sentiment of humour also, in which sphere the writer stands unique in the history of Sanskrit literature

As in theory, so in practice, the erotic sentiment (*śṛngāra rasa*) enjoys a predominant place among the nine *rasas* in Sanskrit literature [1]

In Daṇḍin also, the sentiment enjoys its traditional position Both its aspects—successful love leading to union of lovers and disappointed love or separation—have been delineated by him though the real charm of love in separation scarcely finds its legitimate place in his writings The love culminating in union is the favourite sentiment with him and he has developed it in all its aspects and details As fundamental determinants (*ālambana vibhavas*) the charms of female form have often been depicted by him with reality, colour and imagination He stands unparalleled in graphically portraying the charming limbs of a damsel and her ornaments and bodily decoration He draws some unique pictures of erotic effect in his works such as those of the sleeping Ambalikā, Kandukavatī at play with a ball[2] and others in different postures arousing a passion for them in their lovers and serving as effective fundamental determinants generating the dominant emotion of love (*rati*) which finally ripens into erotic sentiment As an instance his erotic portrayal of Kalpa-

1 Cp on *rasas* above pt II ch VIII also cp KPr IV 27 ff SD III 1 ff Keith SDr pp 314-26

2. DKC pp 97-8 (Ambālikā) and pp 151-3 (Kandukāvatī) see below also

sundarī may be cited here Upaharavarman addresses himself to his beloved भामिनि [1] ननु बह्वपराद्ध भवत्या चित्तजन्मनो यदमुष्य जीवितभूता रतिराकृत्या कदर्थिता, धनुर्यष्टिरभ्रूलताभ्या, भ्रमरमालामयी ज्या नीलालकद्युतिभि, अस्त्राण्यपाङ्ग वीक्षितै महारजनध्वजपटांशुक दन्तच्छदमयूख जालै, प्रथमसुहृन्मलयमारुत परिमलपटीयसा निश्वासपवनेन परभृतरुतमति मञ्जुलै प्रलापै, पुष्पमयी पताका भुजयष्टिभ्यां, दिग्विजयारम्भकुम्भमिथुन मुरोजकुम्भयुगलेन, क्रीडासरो नाभिमण्डलेन, सनाह्यरथ श्रोणिमण्डलेन भवन रत्नतोरणस्तम्भयुगलमूरुयुगलेन, लीलाकर्णकिसलय चरणतलप्रभाभि ।
"Gracious lady you have certainly wrought much wrong on our lord Cupid You have utterly eclipsed his beloved (*Rati*) with your form his bow with your creeper like eyebrows his bow-string formed of a row of bees with your beautiful dark blue locks of hair his arrows with your side long glances the silk of his saffron dyed banner with the ruddy rays darting from your lips his dearest friend the Malaya breeze with the sweet fragrance of your breath, the cooings of *kokilas* with your charming words his flowery banner with your long and slender arms, the two auspicious jars filled with water at the beginning of his quarter conquest with your two rounded breasts, his pleasure-lake with your deep and circular navel his battle-chariot with your round hips the twin pillars of the jewelled arch of his mansion with your twin thighs and the tender sprout sportively hung on his ears with the lustre of the soles of your feet " [1]

The excitant determinants (*uddīpana vibhavas*) which foster sentiment when it has arisen appear in two forms The description of bodily postures actions and gestures constitutes the first form which we often observe in Daṇḍin The picturesque depiction of Kandukāvatī s dancing and playing with a ball which serves as an element exciting the passionate love in the heart of Mitragupta is a befitting example of the form [2] Another notable instance is the description of Navamālikā s curious condition intermixed with the feelings of alarm, wonder, joy passion fear and sportive gestures at the sight of the hero[3] who

1 DKC pp 114-5
2 DKC pp 151-3
3 DKC p 140

observing her graceful actions, develops an instantaneous affection for her The second form of excitant determinants consists in the portrayal of nature as an agency stimulating the emotion Nature with its multifarious forms and colours often comes in in his writings, as an exciting factor for the emotion of love In connection with the description of Rajahaṁsa s amorous sports in harem, the writer graphically portrays the six seasons with all their natural accompaniments, with special reference to their effect on the minds of lovers [1] The elaborate description forms a vast and deep and surging ocean of erotic sentiment

The consequents or the external manifestations of feelings (*anubhavas*) and the transitory or evanescent feelings (*samcari bhāvas*) have also been depicted with perfect skill and imagination by the writer The various amorous reactions of lovers which make the sentiment cognisable and the numerous feelings alternately accompanying and thereby strengthening the dominant emotion of love have been frequently delineated by him in his erotic paintings

His love portraits develop the dominant emotion (*sthayi bhāva*) into the state of erotic sentiment (*śṛngara rasa*) with the help of the depiction of beauteous damsels as fundamental determinants, of physical and natural beauty as exciting phenomena of the side long glances voluptuous kisses and embraces as consequents, and of feelings like desire joy anxiety, distraction and despair as accompanying *bhāvas*

It is generally complained that the writer very often condescends to indecency of situation and indelicacy of expression in his love pictures which are at times highly sensuous The amorous sport of Rājavahana and Avantisundarī as also that of Upahāravarman and Kalpasundarī have been described with utter frankness in glaringly bold language [2] In the *Avantisundari katha* also various postures of amorous play have been depicted in flagrant words [3] In fact Daṇḍin s sensualistic attitude towards love which he describes through Kāmamañjarī as a peculiar kind

1 ASK pp 24-37, also cp below ch IV for depiction of nature
2 DKC pp 55 ff and 115 also cp pp 121 158 etc.
3 Cp pp 24-37 72

of physical contact yielding the highest pleasure to impetuous hearts,[1] is responsible to a great extent for his indecency in its depiction According to him (if the courtesan really represents his viewpoint in this respect) it is for the sake of this pleasure only that men—even men who live in the most sacred places—endure severe penances, give liberal gifts, fight tough battles and undertake risky enterprises[2] Through Mitragupta, he defines love as determination to possess[3] and, true to the conception it appears as self fulfilment throughout the work

It is evident that Daṇḍin pre eminently elaborates the physical side of love, and there is hardly any reference to its spiritual aspect As A B Keith rightly observes love in Daṇḍin appears in the lightest and the most passionate form as an affair of the senses, the hero shows his portrait to his emissary, bids him exhibit it to the maiden and she will at once ask if the world really contains a person so beautiful [4]

He depicts mainly "love at first sight love which demands fulfilment without delay and despises every obstacle' [5] The writer is guilty of often degrading the erotic sentiment into ob scenity His fault is, to some extent, due to his lop sided con ception of the great human emotion and partly it is the result of his abhorrently realistic attitude towards life which makes him to bring to the limelight the darkest stratum of the society The serious fault must also be shared partially by the tendencies prevailing at the time in the sphere of art and literature which did not mind much the flagrance of expression and in a way encouraged frankness and bare faced depiction of beauty It must also be remembered that the social law of the time allowed polygamy and recognised and respected the institution of courte sans As a natural corollary, the poets of the time took pleasure in vividly portraying the female charms and the delights of love Daṇḍin therefore, placed as he was in the peculiar social, cul

1 DKC p 71 कामस्तु विषयातिसक्तजनयोः स्त्रीपुंसयोरतिशयसुखस्पर्श विशेष ।
2. Cp *loc cit*
3 Cp pp 156 कः काम ? सङ्कल्प, 164 ff
4 CSL p 61
5 Cp *loc cit*

tural and literary atmosphere could hardly avoid the offence and in view of the fact a wholesale condemnation of his love poetry is unjust, though some of his serious departures from good taste deserve censure both from the eastern and western standpoints The love scenes which do not injure our refined *sensibility and which come up to the mark from aesthetic view* point deserve, on the other hand all praise

Daṇḍin excels in the delineation of heroic sentiment also Apart from its realisation in the tales of heroic adventures in the *Daśakumāracarita* we have in *Avantīsundarīkatha* an elaborate development of the sentiment in the description of the Magadha Mālava battle which has been set forth in the fullest possible detail covering over fifty pages [1] Besides the lengthy depiction of various divisions of army there is portrayal also of situations which evoke the sentiment of heroism The message of the king of Mālava to the Magadha ruler comes as an effective excitant determinant to inflame the energetic emotion in the heart of the latter king The royal envoy reads out the communication मतस्त्वामेकवीर भूयोऽपि समरप्रवर्तनाय प्रार्थये । यत्रप प्रचलितवीरबाहुपादप वनपवनवाहिनी (?) समावकीर्यंत महानवमानराशि तदतिभारनामित वा दुरुद्वह शिर । श्रेयानसावेक एव य शिलीमुखप्रकरपातव्यचिताशोकपुनाग-नागव्यूहेषु सपूर्णे काममूलमित्रपरभृतश्रेणिखलाकुलारण्यके स्फुरत्प्रभासिलता-वनादहासभासुरेषु (?) रणवसन्तवासरेषु वीरगोष्ठीविहारशील स्यानदत्तदन्त खरतरनखरप्रहारो रागपटलमोचनोदर लीलायमाना विजयलक्ष्मीं सकच ग्रह रन्तुमाक्पति । तद बधान परिकरम् क्षरितक्षतजकुल्या रुधिरचन्दना-नुलिप्तमूतयस्त्रिदशवारविलासिनीसाक्षिभलापकटाक्षलक्षिता विलसन्तु विक्रम क्रीडया योधपुरुषा । रक्तपानमाचरतु प्रनत्तश्चान्त पिशाचजग । सवतता च व्यवशान्तदर्पोष्मणा सुभटजीविताहारोपहारेण भगवान वैवस्वत । 'I request you, the pre eminent hero, to fight a battle again so that the heap of insult I suffered at your hands in the last conflict may be swept off, for I can no longer carry the head hung down under the great burden of ignominy on my person He *alone is fortunate who, overfond of enjoying the company of* valiant heroes, forcibly draws towards himself the goddess of Victory in order to dally with her, himself beautifully adorned

---

1 Cp pp 62–115

with scars and blood drops in the vernal days of battle Gird up therefore, your loins Let the brave soldiers with their bodies besmeared with red sandal in the form of blood play the game of valour and let the heavenly damsels indulgently gaze upon them Let the demons, exhausted after a prolonged dance in merriment, enjoy the wine of their blood and let the god of Death satiate himself with the presents of the lives of brave fighters now lying unconscious, the fire of their arrogance having been extinguished following their heroic end '[1]

The exhortative speeches of the rulers of Magadha and Anga countries which they deliver to their soldiers during their march against the Malavas are equally energetic and spirited The lord of Magadha exhorts his military men प्राप्तश्चायमवसर पराक्रमस्य । प्रत्यासन्नो हि रिपुरुपसमाहृतबलसमुदय । तदिह महत्याहवक्रतौ ऋमसमिद्धहुताशने हुतशरीराहूतय पुरुहूतविषयमारुरुक्षवो यथासुखमृजुनानेन वर्त्मनाधिरोहन्तु । यस्येव प्रयोजने न बुद्धि , प्रिय वा जीवितम, ऋण वा निस्तर णीयम, अनुत्पन्ना वा सतति अपरिपूर्णा वा मनोरथा , अतप्त वा चित्तम चिराहृते कलत्रे यो वा पित्रोरेकपुत्र गुरु कुटुम्बम यस्य वा तपसि श्रद्धा, यो वा लोकानमून उपायान्तरेण जिगीषति स इत प्रतिनिवर्तताम् । 'And an opportunity of displaying heroism has come the foe aided by a powerful army has arrived Let those therefore who wish to ascend to the region of the gods tread this easy path, offering as oblations their bodies in this great sacrifice in the form of war If there be any man who does not mean it, or who cares for life more than anything else or who wants to survive to repay some debt or to beget an offspring or to achieve an unfulfilled ambition or whose heart is not yet satiated with his young bride or who may be the only son of his parents or who has to support a large family or who inclines to practise penance or prefers to conquer the next world by other means let him go back from the battlefield '[2] Equally enthusiastic and inspiring are the words of Simhavarman the Anga chief who sets at rest the above apprehensions of the king सत्यमिदं यदाह देव । स च वराक प्रियमभिमुखागता भ्रामयति शरज्ज्योत्स्नामन्तरयति अमृतकुल्यामुल्लङ्घयति

1 Cp pp 57–8

2. Cp pp 73–4

मलयमारुत व्यवदधाति, पारिजातपरिमलप्रसङ्गे नासापुट पिदधाति, वसन्तोपवनप्रवेशे चक्षु समीलयति चन्दनचर्चापातने कञ्चुक परिधत्ते, यो मनोरथशतप्रार्थितोपस्थित रणमहोत्सवमननुभूय प्रतिनिवर्तते । कस्तादृश खलु पुरुष कुत्सित ? न तथैते भूपतय । जातिप्रतिबद्धमेषा शौर्य नसर्गिक गर्जितम्, औत्पत्तिकम अन्यद् सह महाप्रतापानलम स्वाभाविक बलम । स तु त्वदादेशे नास्त्यमीषा दुष्कर नाम । उदधीनपि उदीर्णहुतभुज सतृष्णमापिबेयु लता इव सकुसुमा दिशोऽपि स्फुरितग्रहतारका सलीलमावर्जयेयु , चक्रमिव उदयरक्त पतगमङगुल्या भ्रामयेयु पुण्डरीकमिव समणाल सितमयूख मृगाङ्कमुत्तसक रचयेयु । यत्तु निवृत्तिकारणत्वेनोप यस्त देवेन, तत्रैतच्चिन्त्यम् । समरमरणे सशयित स्वग इति शास्त्रस्यातिशङ्कया यागादिष्वपि तत्समानम । प्रिय जीवितमिति, तत्पूर्वमेव त्वत्सुकृते क्रीतम । ऋण निस्तरणीयमिति, बलवद भर्तृपिण्डस्यानृण्यम अनुत्पन्ना सततिरिति सुलभव स्यात्सुरत्र रिक्ता सतति । अपूर्णा कामा इति, नैतत्स्वव्यवनिकल्पतरौ । न तृप्ता दारेष्विति, रणत्यागाभिवृत्तपुस्त्वस्य कि दारै ? शिशोरेकपुत्र इति, तेन पितरौ जीवपुत्रौ य सोष्मा ।

'What your lordship says is true The man who returns from the field of battle occasioned by an earnest wishing for it, without enjoying it as a great festivity, is verily like one who pushes back the approaching fortune wards off the autumnal moonlight leaps over the ambrosial stream avoids the Malaya breeze closes his nostrils at the fragrance of a heavenly flower, shuts his eyes at the sight of vernal beauty and shuns the sandal paste But who indeed is such a wretched fellow ? Bravery in these warriors is hereditary their thundering voice is innate, they command a natural prowess and strength and fiery glow If you please to order nothing is difficult for them to accomplish they can thirstily drink up the ocean set ablaze with submarine fire, they can sportively bend down even as flowery creepers the starry quarters they can easily brandish with their fingers the solar disc they can make the white rayed moon their ear ornament but with regard to what you put forward as possible excuses for a cowardly retreat the following may be observed if attainment of heaven after a heroic death is doubted, it is equally doubtful after sacrificial performances even if one su pects scriptures How could the life already sold out to you be dear ? If some debt is to be repaid, acquittance of obligation of the morsels of the master is more important How

could there be an unsatisfied person when you a desire granting tree, are the reigning king ? If there be any one still wishing to enjoy his wife how can one who discards manhood by running away from the battle field relish the sexual pleasure ? If some body be the only son of his parents only those parents who possess a spirited son have their son really alive '[1]

Next comes the sentiment of humour The writer s real istic outlook on life accompanied by his light temperament is chiefly responsible for a vivid perfection of the comic sentiment in his works His peculiarly realistic approach to life makes him to expose it fully, and heartily satirise its artificial, hypo critical and debased objects His light humour provides us with fresh and healthy laughter, while at the same time it also strikes effectively at the root of the rotten limbs of the society The delineation of humour in him it may be remarked is nowhere indecent or irrelevant His *Dasakumāracarita* is comparatively rich in point of delineation of the comic sentiment Every story in it presents numerous comic situations which afford us much of fun and laughter We shall discuss here the sentiment with reference both to the characters and the situations and shall also notice its ideal and verbal aspects

Although there is no scope for the humorous character of the traditional clown (*vidūṣaka*) or a king s son in law (*rāṣṭriya*) in prose romances as we find them in dramas there are in Danḍin's works certain characters which evoke in us the emotion of mirth Caṇḍavarman the officiating king of Ujjain develops a fondness for his cousin Avantisundarī who however ignores him and loves instead the prince Rājavāhana In jea lousy, he foolishly wonders how she is attached to him treating with disdain the man lions like himself ![2] While he scrupulously observes that she is wicked and is a defiler of her family, he ridiculously fails to see his own ignobility in wishing to ap propriate her His character partly resembles that of the funny lover, Śakāra in Śudraka s *Mṛcchakaṭika*

A striking feature of Daṇḍin s realisation of the sentiment

1 Cp pp. 74-6
2 DKC p 57

is his device of nicknaming his characters in a humorous but significant manner Man by nature takes pleasure in laughing at the cost of others, knowing fully well that others would also do so at his cost, and so do the characters of Dandin also do The merchant s son Vasupalita is jeered, for his being foremost among the ugly, as *Virupaka*, while his handsome rival is complimented as *Sundaraka* For his over generosity, Dhanamitra is mocked by the people as *Udāraka* It is irony of fate that though named *Dhanamitra* a friend of wealth, he purchases enmity with it Again, Kāmamañjari whose name *signifies her cupidity discards covetousness and instead nurtures* greed which fact changes her name to *Lobhamañjari* (a flower bud of greed) The poor Kośadāsa also gets his name corrected by his jealous enemies to *Vesadasa*, a brothel s slave for his inordinate passion for the courtesan, Candrasenā and the new name is known to both of them ! The neighbouring women flout the new bride Ratnavati by replacing the *ratna* (jewel) of her name by *nimba* (the Nimb tree) for her having bitterly annoyed her husband in private A *kulaputra* of Mathurā is jeered for having picked up many a quarrel with people by the significant name of *Kalahakantaka* (a thorn of quarrels) [1]

Besides there are a number of humorous situations in his writings which provoke our laughter Rajavāhana s curious marriage with Avantisundari affords us real amusement The spectators take the ceremony for a part of the magic show and the prince fulfils his mission The king enjoys the charming scene of the princess marriage, knowing the least of the great price he would have to pay for it, while we laugh at his cost [2] Equally delightful is the transfiguration of the silver chain binding the captive prince, into a beautiful nymph in a curious manner [3] The writer also mocks here the short temper of ascetics who throw ridiculous curses on their innocent offenders The sage Markandeya curses Suratamañjari a heavenly damsel

1 Cp for these nicknames DKC pp 74 (*Sundaraka* and *Virupaka*) 78 (*Udāraka*) 87 (*Lobhamañjari*), 150 (*Vesadāsa*) 164 (*Nimbavati*) and 167 (*Kalahakantaka*)

2. PP pp 53–4 cp ASKS VII 59 ff

3 DKC pp 59–60

whose pearl necklace falls on him when bathing, to become a silver chain

More amusing is the episode of Marici s delusion—or ra ther disillusion—at the hands of the courtesan Kamamañjarī who wins a wager at his cost The writer here effectively deri des the common belief in fortune tellers by exposing their utter ignorance of their own fate What delights us most is the fact that the sage still hopes to get his divine sight back and be able to oblige the prince Apahāravarman It is a mockery of his fate that instead of bringing the harlot's daughter to senses he loses his own No greater satire is possible on the weakness of man for the opposite sex Marici s sincere promise to the harlot s mother must have evoked her as well as her daughter s laughter, knowing as they did that his solemn pledge would not be reali-sed Kāmamañjari s clever advocacy of the superiority of *dharma* on the ground that it is not at all injured by free enjoyment of *artha* (wealth) and *kama* (sexual pleasure) is interesting Her clever words of advocacy entrap the poor ascetic who is led as tray by her perverse and illusive arguments in apparent favour of *dharma* The laborious collection of weak points of gods and sages who allowed their *dharma* to move side by side with sexual pleasure succeeds in convincing the ascetic who remarks at the end ' O graceful damsel, you have taken a proper view of things inasmuch as you say that the *dharma* of him who has known the truth is not obstructed by worldly enjoyment [1] The most interesting situation occurs at the end when on one hand, Marīci, no longer an ascetic becomes a votary of the god of Love and feels uneasy in separation from Kāmamañjarī now his beloved, even for a moment, and on the other, his un feeling love strikes at him the thunderbolt in the form of the following words ' Revered Sir here I fold my hands to you this your servant has been long favoured, now please return to your pious duties ' [2]

The story of Apahāravarman provides us with another

1 DKC p 70 मयि विलासिनि, साधु पश्यसि । न धमस्तत्वदर्शिना विषया पमागतोपरुध्यत इति ।

2 Cp DKC p 72

humorous situation in the episode of Virupaka Virupaka s utter ugliness presents a sharp contrast to his being chosen by the courtesan in preference to another youth of handsome form The writer here satirises the excessive greed of the harlots for money Fate plays a trick with Virupaka who gains fortune only to hasten towards utter misfortune The poor fellow again creates a funny scene by hastily stepping into the Jain path only to retrace his steps very soon The writer here holds to ridicule the human weakness which takes heresy for religion, thinking it to be easy to follow When faced with tortures of heterodoxy, man discards the false faith calling it a swindle And so does Virūpaka do Left only with a rag to cover his privities, he thinks it an easy step to become a nude mendicant and throws off the rag for one who, like himself, may fall a prey to the harlot ! When, however, he is subjected, 'like a newly caught elephant', to bodily tortures his enthusiasm for the new faith gives place to a strong distaste for it

Apahāravarman's art of burglary also provides much humour He takes to the profession with a missionary object of teaching the people the voidness of worldly possessions by robbing them of their things He regards it as a path laid down by the *ācārya* Karnīsuta Well equipped with a complete set of instruments for burglary, he sets out on his avocation His practical joke turns in a few months millionaires into beggars and *vice versa* and creates the comic situation of wealthy misers of the city begging for alms with broken platters in their hands at the houses of their previous supplicants now made rich with their own wealth

The cunning fraud played by the significantly named *Śṛgalikā* on Kāntaka is also amusing The nurse befools the jailer by making him to believe that the princess loves him and also by presenting him as from his beloved various gifts includ ing a garland worn the previous day by herself, a betel roll from her own mouth a residual unguent and an unclean garment As a matter of fact the entire tale of Apahāravarman affords us a great deal of fun and merriment in its varied incidents and situations The hero of the story is an amusing character who creates numerous funny scenes He makes a joke

even out of himself when he observes that at the sight of the princess in the harem which he enters for theft, he has got his own heart stolen by her[1] Enamoured of the coquettish glances of the courtesan Rāgamañjari, he conveniently thinks that she is the presiding deity of the city (*nagaradevata*), and, incensed at his thefts in the town, she has bound him with the chains of her sportive side glances[12]

Equally interesting is the situation which presents Arthapāla comparing the lovely maiden whom he discovers in a sub terranean palace to the goddess of royal sovereignty taking refuge in the cavern in order to avoid the sight of iniquitous monarchs[3] A great irony of fate sends Arthapāla to the under ground palace to bring the goddess back upon the earth, as though he were an ideal man to rule the world[1]

The writer creates humour also in the story of Mitragupta who capriciously suggests a novel method of putting off an un desired lover to Candrasena He advises her to deface herself by the use of certain unguent to which suggestion the harlot, who lives by her beauty sharply retorts that she is the last woman to part with her beauteous form She good humouredly thanks him for the advice which, she fears, she cannot act upon[4]

The last chapter of the romance also provides some amus ing scenes The entire story of Vihārabhadra s misguiding the young king presents an interesting situation Humour comes out of the hypocrisy of human nature which rejoices in posing as a well wisher and at the same time striking at the vitals of an innocent enemy Human mind is also clever in forging convinc ing arguments in favour of any bad thing as also against any good thing in life Viharabhadra s ridiculing a king s pro gramme for day time as detailed by Kauṭilya is full of irony and sarcasm He exposes to derision for instance the idea of a king devoting the first watch of the day when he has scarcely washed his mouth fully or eaten a morsel to auditing Again he laughs at the pitiable scene of a king rising from his royal

1 DKC p 93 cp ASKS VIII 94
2 DKC p 84
3 DKC p 134
4 DKC pp 153-4

seat and stretching forth his hands to receive taxes from his subjects He also pities the plight of a king who is allotted just an hour and a half for entertainment and is allowed to go to bed only when trumpets sound, and to add to the misery, for three hours only ! Here also he doubts if the poor man gets any repose, for his mind, says he, is distracted constantly by anxious thoughts He humorously likens a king burning midnight oil in studies to a *brahmana* pupil striving for higher knowledge Humorously enough the adviser prostrates himself before the king on the ground while the king his pupil, lifts him up with the remark "Surely you are my preceptor why do you then act in a way contrary to the position of a teacher ! "[1] The scene is really funny—a humble pupil raising a still humbler preceptor from obedient prostration !

A subtle wit also attends the elaborate manipulation of the vices, forbidden to a king into virtues Human mind is clever enough to justify its weaknesses and exhibit them as points of strength Candrapālita exalts hunting as the best form of exercise which smartens up both body and mind It also imparts to a king a practical knowledge of Zoology and Botany and helps him save his subjects from wild beasts [2] More sarcastic is the suggestion that gambling teaches a man the lesson of renunciation and bestows upon him the unique tranquillity of mind which makes him indifferent both to gain and loss Like the science of logic, it sharpens intellect, involving as it does the employment of subtle tricks, and like the science of Yoga it adds to the power of mental concentration [3] Even sexual indulgence has been extolled on the plea that it makes the objects of wealth (*artha*) and virtue (*dharma*) yield their fruit Besides as the seducer argues it reveals pride in manhood and produces skill in knowing the inner sentiments of human beings and proficiency in arts the process of winning a damsel loved and enjoying and

---

1 DKC p 194 ननु हितोपदेशाद गुरवो भवन्त । किमिति गुरुत्वविपरीतमनुष्ठितम् ? For his famous harangue cp pp 190–4
2 DKC p 196 also cp Kaut VIII 3 46 Śāk II 5
3 DKC pp 196–7, also cp Mṛcch II 5 f द्यूत हि नाम पुरुषस्यासिंहासन राज्यम् ।

pleasing her affords one an opportunity for eloquence and ingenuity, it gives a lover an imposing look on account of the winsome dress and toilet he wears for her, and also a courteous and sweet behaviour, it is the source of felicity not only here but, by the generation of progeny, also hereafter Drinking also is eulogised for the medicinal virtue of various liquors Besides, it dissipates anxiety by totally obliterating from memory the crimes committed and engenders a sense of self sufficiency and confidence inspired by free and frank talks Particularly does it suit the kings whom it makes fearless and energetic in battles The curious arguments in defence of the proclaimed offences[1] create real humour, though the ill intentioned joke costs the new king both his life and realm

The writer satirises still another human weakness in the story Though professing to be engaged in a labour of love man does not and actually cannot forget self interest as for instance Viśruta while helping Bhaskaravarman in getting back his lost kingdom, does not let his own interest alone and cleverly manages to get his sister as remuneration in advance for his services ! The spreading of the rumour of Bhāskaravarman having been kept concealed by the goddess Durga who would reveal him in due course as the rightful king has been devised in a humorous manner the queen calls in private the senior ministers and old citizens and tells them about the favour the goddess did her in dream and asks them to keep the secret[2] knowing fully well that in this way the news will get an early and wide circulation

The other romance also depicts a number of humorous situations The happy comments of the *brahmanas* who are offered rich gifts by the king before he proceeds to meet his enemy in battle provide much fun and laughter A *brahmana* for instance who raceives a pearl necklace bursts into the joyous remark The necklace radiates with lustre like full moon my lady generally blushes on putting on such a beauteous

1 Cp for detail DKC pp 196–8
2. DKC p 204

string "[1] Much witty is the trick of the old hunter who, in order to save the child Upahāravarman from being sacrificed as an offer to the goddess Durgā by the forest inhabitants, steals into the temple of the goddess and hides himself behind the image When a *śabara* brings the child and, laying it down before the image, raises his knife to strike at him he utters in a solemn and serious tone the words 'Begone, your evils are ended" and the old *sabara* takes to his heels without looking back !

The story of Vyāḍi also presents a pleasant element of humour His wife was in her previous life a mouse who stole into an ascetic s alms bag during his visit to holy places and accidentally fell into the sacred stream of Gangā and by dint of the religious merit thus accrued was reborn as the dear spouse of Vyāḍi [3] The writer here satirises the superstitious belief that even a casual visit to, and an accidental dip into, the sacred waters wins a man a higher birth Equally humorous is the tale of Upavarṣa and his curious-pupils[4] who go in for acquiring knowledge either in order to evade public derision as ignorant ascetics or with a view to attaining a beautiful damsel The writer s satire on the object of acquiring knowledge is subtle and deep Again, the tale provides a funny scene the uninspired pupils move about in search of a *srutadhara*[5] with whom only they are to be taught They find an able fellow student in Vararuci, a boy of five whom they carry turn by turn on their shoulders and travel a long distance from some town on the bank of Godāvarī to their preceptor at Kuṇḍina When they enquire there about Upavarṣa, their preceptor people laugh at them wondering if there were men who had something to do even with Upavarṣa whom even his own wife considers to be a good for nothing fellow The poor lady feels surprised to note that her husband is wanted by some people First she takes it for a joke,

1 ASK p 61 for other facetious remarks cp pp 61–2
2 ASK pp 173–4 ASKS III 112 ff
3 ASK p 180 ASKS III 32
4 Cp ASK pp 179–82 also ASKS IV 21–58
5 *Śrutadhara* (ASK pp 181–2) is one who retains in memory what is heard only once

weeps and scolds them, for she might have been facing similar jokes from the light hearted people of the city on account of her foolish husband Equally amusing is the story of Upavarṣa's earlier life The wife of his elder brother, Varṣa, a great scholar makes a serious joke at his cost [1] Anxious to avert the evil, if any, of being married to a foolhardy in the next birth she performs a ceremony called *murkhavrata* in which a fool is to be feasted and offered a pair of new clothes She finds in Upavarṣa a fit recipient of her gift The poor man, rebuked bitterly by his wife for being unlettered, observes fast to propitiate the god Subrahmanya in order to be blessed with knowledge He plants in the temple premises the seeds of millet and keeps fast until an offering is to be made to the god from its yield Unluckily, an ox consumes the plant just when it is about to ripen, making the poor fellow to go through the process once again, We heartily enjoy the curious rites performed to achieve the equally curious ends It is not that the writer depicts them with faith in them, he in fact derides them in a sarcastic way A keen observer of human follies and weaknesses, he succeeds in exposing them in public and satirising them in a light tone

There are in Daṇḍin instances of verbal humour also the most striking of them being the one where Upahāravarman disguised as queen asks the king Vikaṭavarman to swear by the holy fire to confine his love in future with his newly wrought beauteous form to the queen alone Before the poor fellow actually proceeds to take an oath to that effect, the prince repudiates the necessity of such an assurance for *she* says no woman on earth would dare offend *her*, while *she* has no objection to his union with the divine nymphs *She* asks him to tell his secrets which having been related, his natural form would disappear [2] Little did the fool know the import of the significant words which implied the fall of his mortal body (*svarupabhramśa*) and his departure for the heavenly abode (*apsarobhih*

1 ASK p 181 ASKS IV 43 ff also cp KSS I 2

2. Cp DKC p 120 कि मा शपथेन ? क्व हि मानुषी मां परिभविष्यति ? यद्यप्सरोभि सगच्छसे, सगच्छस्व कामम् । कथय कानि ते रहस्यानि, तत्र यान्ति हि त्वत्स्वरूपभ्रंश ।

sam√gam)

Brilliant instances of verbal humour are afforded by the chief prince who makes keen witted remarks on the tales of different princes His following remark on the adventures of Mitragupta who disguises himself as an ascetic wearing twisted hair in order to contrive to kill the Āndhra king and to usurp his kingdom, is characterised by a deep wit and subtle humour "Wonderful is the part played by *the great ascetic* His *extremely austere penance* bore fruit just in this life "[1] for otherwise penance fructifies in the next birth !

As A B Keith observes Daṇḍin s wit and humour are ' far more attractive to modern taste than are usually these qualities in Indian works The whole work (*Daśakumāracarita*) is pervaded by the humour of the wild deeds of the princes, their *determination to secure what they wish and their light hearted* indifference to the morality of the means which they employ '[2] Although Daṇḍin's romances do not claim to be open satires, they mean to satirise certain aspects of contemporary life There are brilliant examples of real wit and poignant satire in them and they stand in this respect unparalleled in the history of Sanskrit literature

PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE

Although no writer deliberately employs his material as the vehicle of any specific theory or idea about life, his works reflect the impression that life makes upon him, since his general theme in ultimate analysis is life The impression may be suggested by the selection and arrangement of material, development of story presentation of characters and above all by special emphasis on certain ethical or moral principles casually entering a work[3] We shall study here the writer s idea about life or his philosophy of life on the basis of the above factors

It may be affirmed at the outset *that the writer has not had any didactic object in view in* composing his romances

1 DKC p 186 चित्रम इद महामुनेवृत्तम् अत्रैव खलु फलितमतिकष्ट तप ।
2 Cp HSL p 302
3 Cp Hudson *Intro to Study of Lit* pp 163–5

J Hertel strangely enough found in the *Dasakumaracarita* an attempt to teach ethical doctrines[1] Evidently this is an exaggeration and is, as A B Keith remarks, an injustice to the author whose real object was to give pleasure No doubt he had an intimate knowledge of the rules of polity and ethics, and had a close familiarity with the world around him and also had a unique quality of keen observation and frank expression but he never appears in his writings as a moralist

He was a votary of Brāhmanical religion no doubt but he seems to develop no special affiliations to any particular sect, though we may observe his inclination towards the Vaiṣṇava faith Generally he patronises the Brahmanical ideals of life, as for instance the doctrines of action and the fruit thereof and of rebirth, which have been amply reflected in his writings His attitude towards the institutions of castes and stages of life may have been sympathetic but he has little patience to see them translated into strict action in actual life His detestation for the Jain and Buddhist faiths which he derides as heretical paths[2] is quite evident

From the general tenor of his works we get an inevitable impression of his realistic outlook on life He depicts a society which has little or no respect for higher values of morality and professes curious moral considerations which openly justify objectionable deeds The proclaimed offender in Apahara varman cherishes the moral ideal that the poor should be made rich and the oppressor should be suitably punished Mantra gupta usurps the kingdom of Āndhra by cruel machinations but poses himself as a great believer The stark realism of outlook which Daṇḍin presents through these characters is quite in keeping with the general tenor of his works

Of the four objects of life his attitude with regard to the final beatitude (*mokṣa*) seems to be passive he thinks it to be difficult to realise attainable only by the perfection of spiritual knowledge, while he considers paradise (*svarga*) to be within the

1 Cp his trans III 8 ff Keith HSL p 299
2. DKC p 75

reach of every one who discharges the duties of his family [1] He gives duty (*dharma*) its due place in life but on account of his peculiarly realistic attitude, the practical man in him puts special stress on other two ends, namely wealth (*artha*) and pleasure (*kama*) He makes his heroes to take perilous adventures in order to achieve these objects Wealth determines a man's status in society and this seems to be the general attitude of his characters who regard poverty as the sister of contempt and hold that death for those who suffer from the fever of want is an occasion for festivity [2] Puṣpodbhava proceeds to the digging of earth for riches, for he observes that it is money which makes the mare go Apaharavarman takes to burglary (of course, Daṇḍin is not for it) in order to accumulate riches which he considers to be perhaps the most important thing in life, though he pretends to teach its futility to others Viśruta verily represents his friends and also the author when he says that all undertakings that are based on policy emanate from wealth and that there is no sin greater than showing weakness in accumulating riches [3] The attitude closely approaches to the outlook of the writers on polity and law The author also recognises the importance of pleasures of love in life though he certainly does not agree with his characters who engage themselves in all sorts of heinous crimes in order to gratify their senses We cannot call our author a hedonist who believes in the doctrine that pleasure is the highest good He has however, an irresistible yearning for drinking the joyous wine of life to the full and the fact leads him towards a bright optimism Those who admit a defeat or try to escape from the problems of life are cowards for no sin is greater than abandonment of the self [4] All the fortunes of the world rest in life which if once destroyed cannot be regained, for no throat that is cut asunder can be rejoined [5] If misfortunes come in life as they do one need

1 DKC p 68
2 Cp (a) DKC p 82 (b) ASK p 177 see App XI
3 DKC p 210, cp Kaut IX 7 81 KNit XIII 33 Mṛcch I 37
4 DKC p 82 also cp Gītā VI 5
5 Cp (a) ASK p 39 (b) DKC p 82

not feel depressed He should react them boldly, the calamities may be averted, but if at all they persist, he should face them heroically, for it is no use shedding tears for the inevitable [1] The bold and unyielding attitude leads to venturesome spirit which his characters amply display An adventurous man feels quite at home at any place, as Apahāravarman suggests to his risk fearing friend Udaraka But a man of talent and spirit does not leave his country out of fear [2] In order to enjoy the plea sures of life one must possess a strong will power and firm determination, for, as the wise say, fortune favours one who is active and ambitious and resolute [3] There is nothing impossible or difficult to achieve for one who commands extraordinary prowess valour and talent [4]

Although the writer is a fervent advocate of unyielding spirit he does not altogether obliterate the existence of the un foreseen which, he believes, plays a vital role in shaping human destiny Even Apahāravarman, the boldest of his characters submits that a man however ingenious he may be, cannot escape the Providence [5] Similarly the writer ascribes the serious lapse, in the form of taking meat, on the part of Damodarasvāmin his great grand father to Providence which, he says, is divinely ordained and hence cannot be overstepped [6] Nevertheless, he would not allow his fatalism to override the spirit of endeavour and perseverance Human exertion is often observed fighting bravely against divine ordinances, and the spirit reflects the writer s healthy attitude towards life

The view that Daṇḍin advocates lax morals in life[7] is not correct for his approach to loose principles is satirical rather than approbative His real aim is to expose the darker aspects of life and thus as S K De remarks immorality rather than

1 ASK pp 123–4 also cp Gitā II 27
2 DKC pp 80 150
3 DKC pp 156 181
4 DKC p. 109 see App XI
5 DKC p 89
6 Cp ASK p 10 also cp pp 164 198 KA II 172
7 Cp De (HSL pp 213–4) who quotes Wilson for this view

morality is his deliberate theme[1] But he never pleads it He is fully alive to nobler emotions of life, he believes in them and perhaps wishes to disseminate them in his own peculiar way His attitude towards royal polity was, of course, imperialistic and his social outlook was essentially individualistic in practice, if not in theory As regards the female sex, he appears to advocate its subordination, both in precept and example, to the sterner sex[2]

Thus the poet's philosophy of life consists chiefly in his practical and realistic, but at the same time optimistic, approach to life He hates, on the other hand, overscrupulous and superstitious disposition towards worldly objects, and delights in deriding hypocrisy and hereticism

1 Cp HSL p 214
2 DKC pp 156 f ASK p 200 also cp above

CHAPTER IV

STYLE OF DANDIN

STYLE OF DAṆḌIN IN THE TWO ROMANCES

The transfer of the graces of poetry to prose, which Sanskrit writers effected in their own characteristic way, gave birth to a peculiar prose style in Sanskrit which we generally do not notice in other literatures nor perhaps would we appreciate it elsewhere This process of development of Sanskrit prose accounts for the dictum that prose is the touch stone of poets [1] In such prose *kavyas* imaginative and descriptive material gets the upper hand of the narrative which helplessly lags behind We do not know the writers who led the way to this type of poetical or elaborate prose but Daṇḍin is certainly not the precursor He lays equal stress in his earlier romance on the narrative and the descriptive material though in the *Avantisundarīkathā*, he unfortunately yields to the literary aspirations of the age

It may be admitted at the outset that there is an evident difference of diction in Daṇḍin s two romances which cannot escape even a casual reader s notice But it is futile to make it a basis for doubting the common authorship of the two compositions for despite the divergence for which there is explanation, there is intrinsic affinity suggesting a common mind at work in them It is a general experience to notice variance of style in earlier and later writings of an author The *Daśakumaracarita* which reflects the writer s pride of youth and appreciation of love and beauty at every step is certainly his earlier romance wherein he seems to be the least influenced and sophisticated by the literary trends and tendencies of the age On the other hand the *Avantisundarīkatha* represents the mature mind of the writer who is now an indifferent spectator of youth and beauty

---

1 Cp गद्य कवीना निकष वदन्ति (KASV I 3 21)

and love The graphic depiction of old age, bearing a deep impression of personal observation, in the work evidences the fact that it has come from the old age of the writer [1] There seems to be a considerable gap of time, may be of twenty to thirty years or even more, between the composition of the two romances In the long interval the writer seems to have interested himself in the study of Poetics, resulting into his composition of the *Kavyadarśa* Besides, he might have acquainted himself with contemporary literature and particularly with the then extant prose works including those of Subandhu and Bāṇa Consequently, two evident influences seem to be at work in his later writing, first, that of his study of Poetics and the second, that of the literary tendencies prevailing in his time It is inevitable, therefore, to observe a big gulf between his earlier and later manner of writing and in his general poetic values While the *Daśakumāracarita* is characterised by freedom from convention both with regard to diction and manner of story-telling the later romance is marked by highly flavoured style vying with that of *Vasavadatta* and *Kadambari* We shall, therefore, discuss separately the two distinct types of the writer s prose in his two works

The prose of the *Daśakumaracarita* commands the qualities of perspicuity, grace, sweetness and natural flow It is of course ornate and polished but it happily avoids over embellishment and extravagant elaboration Daṇḍin in fact is seen at his best in this romance wherein he creates a new path for himself Although he applies here the grand style of *Kavya* to his simple narrative, he does so in a moderate proportion He is master here of his own peculiar style which is free from fatal effects of overelaboration and consequently his prose in this romance is reasonably simple elegant and fluent It is marked by the unique quality of *padalalitya* or elegance of diction which gift is attributed by tradition to his poetry He cultivates the graceful diction by harmonious unification of word and sense A special feature of his style in *Daśakumaracarita* is its even

1 Also cp above pt I chs I II for desc of old age in ASK pp 41-2 see below pp 366-7

balance between matter and manner It avoids the sluggish manner of proceeding with the tale and the sentimental di gression and laboured diction The peculiar style suits well the graphic portrayal of his unconventional theme of rogues and rakes of the society The descriptive material does find a place here, but it is never allowed to supersede the narrative There is also the employment of artificial device in the avoidance of labial letters in the seventh *ucchvāsa*, but the fact that it is adequately motived gives it to some extent, a natural colour His use of poetic figures is sparing and effective, it is never overdone or dull

His style in the *Avantisundarīkathā*, which has a deep impress of the diction and manner of the writings of Subandhu and Bana suffers from certain grave defects which stand in the way of appreciating the romance as a romance The style makes the plot subordinate to the enormous descriptive material which seriously hampers the easy movement of the main narrative In the descriptions also a highly embellished diction has been followed the various objects depicted unfold themselves through poetic figures like simile metaphor, apparent incongruity and paronomasia The diction is again overladen with lengthy com pounds and unwieldy sentences formed by a long chain of epithets as also with long speeches and exhortations The writer follows the laboured style in deference to the literary standards of the time and strays afar from the usual course suitable for a true romance It may however be remarked here that to us in the 20th century, the earlier and the simpler romance may appear to be the better piece but it certainly could not have been regarded as such in his own age rather it might have been overlooked as the work of a novice And it is no wonder that its simplicity and unconventionality is not favoured by the theorists in whose works it is not cited till a very late date The *Avantisundarīkathā* on the other hand might have been considered to be a standard work of his

NARRATIVE AND DESCRIPTIVE ELEMENTS

Daṇḍin employs both the narrative and the descriptive elements of prose style in varying degrees in his two romances

Whereas the narrative element is predominant in his earlier work, his later romance subordinates it to the descriptive element The story here moves slowly with frequent interruptions in the form of lengthy descriptions besides a number of episodic tales We have already discussed the narrative element in the two romances, and here we shall refer to the other element in detail The descriptive matter may be divided into three categories namely, (i) portrayal of female beauty (ii) depiction of nature, and (iii) description of cities and countries and armies and battles etc

The *Daśakumaracarita* stands unique in the depiction of female charm which has been portrayed here at least on six different occasions with varying colours The picture of the princess Ambālikā reposing in full confidence in inner apartments demonstrates the writer's power of keen observation, subtle imagination and graphic portraiture It brings out fully the sleeping posture of the maiden and charms of her limbs As the prince Apahāravarman observed, महितमहार्घरत्नप्रत्युप्तसिंहाकारदन्तपादे हंसतूलगर्भशय्योपधानशालिनि कुसुमलवच्छुरितपर्यन्ते पर्यङ्कतले दक्षिणपादपार्ष्ण्यधोभागानुवलितेतरचरणाग्रपृष्ठम् ईषदविवृत्तमधुरगुल्फसंधि, परस्पराश्लिष्टजङ्घाकाण्डम् आकुञ्चितकोमलोभयजानु, किंचिद्वेल्लितोरुदण्डयुगलम्, अधिनितम्बविस्रस्तमुक्तैकभुजलताग्रपेशलम् अपाश्रयान्तनिहिताकुञ्चितेतरभुजलतोत्तानतलकरकिसलयम्, आभुग्नश्रोणिमण्डलम्, अतिश्लिष्टचीनांशुकान्तरीयम्, अनतिवलिततनुतरोदरम्, अनुतरनिश्वासारम्भकम्पमानकठोरकुचकुड्मलम्, आतिरश्चीनबन्धुरशिरोधरोद्देशदृश्यमाननिष्टप्ततपनीयसूत्रपर्यस्तपद्मरागरुचकम् अर्धलक्ष्याधरकर्णपाशनिभृतकुण्डलम्, उपरिपरावृत्तश्रवणपाशरत्नकर्णिकाकिरणमञ्जरीपिञ्जरितविषमव्याविद्धाशिथिलशिखण्डबन्धम्, आत्मप्रभापटलदुर्लक्ष्यपाटलोत्तराधरविवरम्, गण्डस्थलीशशाङ्कहस्तपल्लववर्णितकर्णावतंसकृत्यम्, उपरिकपोलादर्शतलनिषिक्तचित्रवितानपत्रजातिजनितविशेषकश्रियम्, आमीलितलोचनेन्दीवरम्, अविभ्रान्तभ्रूपताकम्, उद्भिद्यमानश्रमजलपुलकभिन्नशिथिलचन्दनतिलकम् आनने दृश्यमानकलङ्कं च विश्वस्तप्रसुप्ताम् राजकन्याम् (अपश्यम्) । ' she lay on a couch the ivory feet of which were shaped to the likeness of recumbent lions and set with splendid, precious gems it was resplendent with the bed and pillows stuffed with downy feathers, with its borders decked with petals of flowers The upper forepart of her left foot was

entwined with the inner side of her right heel, her beautiful ankle joints were a little turned to the side her stout and long legs were in close contact with each other, her tender knees were a little bent and her thighs had a graceful curve She looked charming on account of the extremity of one of her slender arms loosely thrown over the hips while the sprout like hand with its palm outstretched, of the other arm was contracted and thrown under the crown of the head Her round hips were a little curved the fine undergarment of China silk lay closely adhering to her person, and her slim waist was not much bent Her generous breasts like two budding blossoms, were heaving as she was breathing perceptibly, while the ruby necklace, inter woven in the middle with another neck ornament of burnished gold, was lying near the region of her lovely neck resting slan tingly Her ear ornament, lying motionless under her beautiful ear turned down, was half visible Her somewhat loosened braid of hair lying unevenly was tinged red with the cluster of rays from the jewelled ornament of the lovely ear that was turned up, while the space between her upper and lower lips was diffi cult to be discovered owing to the mass of their own ruddy lustre Her blossom hand which passed under her cheek served the purpose of ear pendant The variegated leaves embroidered in the canopy and mirrored into her transparent cheek turned upward served the purpose of the ornamental painting on her cheek Her lotus eyes were closed and banner like eyebrows still The sandal *tilaka* had been moistened and mixed with the drops of perspiration rising up Her long and curly hair hung about the moon of her face '[1]

Equally attractive, though different in nature, is the picture of Maṇikarṇikā reclining in the underground chamber The writer here expresses her loveliness just with the help of five apt similes drawn from mythology and nature, she seemed the crescent moon dispelling with her loveliness the dark of the underworld or the earth goddess in living flesh and blood or Śiva s bride descending to vanquish demons or the blessed love god s love (Rati) sojourning in the world below; or the royal

1 Cp DKC pp 96-8

glory (*Rājalakṣmī*) hiding in a cavern to escape the sight of so many unworthy kings [1] Also subtle is the portraiture of Nava mālikā painted in lying posture Pramati observes that she looks like a heavenly damsel, though she is not one for she has closed her eyes in sleep like the lotus when acted upon by the lunar rays and her cheek bearing the lines of drops of perspiration appearing upon it, looks like a mango fruit yellowish white on being ripe and spotted with drops of sap trickling down the broken stem, and the unguent assumes a palish hue on her plump breasts exceedingly hot on account of the fire of budding youth [2] The picture of Kandukavatī, playing and dancing with a ball has been drawn with remarkable insight and imagination [3] The movements of her limbs and her ornaments along with her flexible body in motion in dance have been depicted with per fect skill The depiction of Gominī with special reference to her well formed limbs presents a real form of beauty unveiled अस्या खलु कन्यकाया सव एवावयवा नातिस्थूला नातिकृशा नातिह्रस्वा नातिदीर्घा न विकटा मृजाव तश्च । रक्ततलाङ्गुली यवमत्स्यकमलकलशाद्यनेकपुण्य लेखालाञ्छितौ करौ, समगुल्फसधी मासलावशिरालौ चाङ्घ्री, जङ्घे चानुपूर्व वृत्ते पीवरोरुग्रस्ते इव दुरुपलक्ष्ये जानुनी, सकृद्विभक्तश्चतुरश्र ककुन्दरविभाग शोभी रथाङ्गाकारसस्थितश्च नितम्बभाग, तनुतरमीषन्निम्न गम्भीर नाभि मण्डलम, वलित्रयेण चालङ्कृतमुदरम, उरोभागव्यापिनावुन्मग्नचुचुकौ विशाला रम्भशोभिनौ पयोधरौ, धनधान्यपुत्रभूयस्त्वचिह्नलेखालाञ्छिततले स्निग्धोदग्र-कोमलनखमणी ऋज्वनुपूर्ववृत्तताम्राङगुली सनतासदेशे सौकुमार्यवत्यौ निमग्नपर्व सधी च बाहुलते, तन्वी कम्बुवृत्तबन्धुरा च कन्धरा, वृत्तमध्यविभक्तरागाधरम् असक्षिप्तचारुचिबुकम् आपूर्णकठिनगण्डमण्डलम, सगतानुवक्रनीलस्निग्धभ्रूलतम् अनतिप्रोदतिलकुसुमसदृशनासिकम् असितधवलरक्तत्रिभागभासुरमधुराधीर सचारमन्थरायतेक्षणम इन्दुशकलसुन्दरललाटम् इन्द्रनीलशिलाकाररम्यालकपङ्क्ति द्विगुणकुण्डलितम्लाननालीकनालललितलम्बश्रवणपाशयुगलम् आननकमलम, अन

---

1 Cp DKC p 134 इन्दुकलेव कलावण्येन रसातलान्धकार निह्नुवाना विष्णुगृहिणीव देवी विश्वभरा, हरगृहिणीवासुरविजयायावतीर्णा, पातालमागता गृहिणीव भगवत कुसुमधन्वन, राजलक्ष्मीरिवानेकदुर्नृपदर्शनपरिहाराय महो विवर प्रविष्टा ।

2. DKC pp 139–40

3. DKC pp 151-3

तिभङ्गुरो बहुल पयन्तेऽप्यकपिलरुचिरायामवान एकैकनिसगसमस्निग्धनीलो गन्धवाही च मूधजकलाप । In the case of this girl, not a single member is too fat or too thin, too short or too long, lacking in symmetry or purity of outline The fingers have a tinge of pink, the hands are marked with many stigmata of fortune—the barley corn the fish, the lotus, the bowl, and others The ankle joints are even the feet plump not stringy The calves have a classic curve and the knees slip almost unobserved into the swell of the thighs The hips are balanced, regular, weetly set, and shaped like chariot wheels The navel has elegance flat ness and depth, the lower body is adorned with three plicatures The breasts with emergent nipples give a broad based beauty to the entire chest The graceful arms are marked with the lines that promise money, grain, and numerous sons, the nails *have a glossy polish like a jewel the fingers are straight, tapering,* pink there is daintiness in the slope of the shoulder, and an absence of knobbiness at the joints The slender neck shows the conch shell s curve The lip has a slight pout and an even colour, the charming chin does not retreat, the cheek is full and firm the brows unite to form a black, soft wavy line the nose resembles a half blown sesamum blossom the great, gentle eyes have a sweet and modest glance yet flashing with three colours—pure black white and the pigmented part the brow charms like the crescent moon the curls are bewitching as a mine of sapphires, each lovely ear has double decoration, its ring and the winsome line of a drooping lotus stem the whole face is like a lily Her hair is abundant, long curly (not kinky) not fading even at the end of a smooth, glossy black throughout and flagrant ' [1]

The *Avantisundarikatha* has but a few pictures of female beauty The portraits of Vasumati, the spouse of Rājahaṁsa and Mandakinī stand by themselves in the work Vasumatī has been portrayed from head to feet in highly embellished manner through figures of speech like simile and poetic fancy [2] Especially noteworthy is the simile with pun which compares her to

1 DKC pp 159–60
2. ASK pp 23–4

Nandana the heavenly garden, which assumes the same form in all the six seasons In point of subtle fancy, the following *utprekṣā* forms the essence of the picture 'She was created by God with the matter comprising of grace art, charm, love and cleverness in lieu of the five elements (earth air, fire, water and ether) [1] In the depiction of Mandākini [2] too, figurative style has been followed

Daṇḍin's portraits of beauty are richly embellished and are fresh in conception and imagination Of female limbs, eyes cheeks and breasts engage his special attention The side glances have been compared to the strings of blue lotuses,[3] while cheeks and breasts have been fancifully likened to the mirrors which reflect the objects facing them [4]

DEPICTION OF NATURE

Daṇḍin depicts nature in its varied phenomena both in the form of fundamental determinants and the excitant ones In the latter form, nature appears as the befitting background for human emotions The depiction of six seasons in the *Avantisundarī kathā* in relation to the delights of love of Rājahamsa[5] brings forth nature in its excitant aspect The elaborate description which refers *inter alia* to the swing play, water sport volup tuous dalliance and stealthy love forms one of the oldest examples of the popular tradition of delineation of six seasons Nature appears also as a living being sympathising with human actions and emotions The writer's depiction of sunset and the approaching night suits well the occasion of the military march ततश्च बहुलबलपरागपरिपीततेजास्तेज इवौर्वाग्नेय्या भूपालशतातपत्रमण्डल-ग्रस्तभुक्तसौष्ठवतया कृतसन्यास इव प्रतस्थेऽस्तगिरिवनानि गैरिकरसरक्ताम्बरो दिवस । नृपशतमकुटकठोरकोटिपाटितपतगपारद (?) पल्लवक्षरिता क्षतज स्रुतिरिवालक्ष्यत लोहितायमाना सन्ध्या । क्षणतालाभिघातभयपलायितस्य

---

1 ASK p 24 लीलाकलाकान्तिरागचातुर्याणि पञ्चैव पञ्चभूतस्थाने प्रतिवि-धाय निर्मितेव प्रजापतिना ।

2. ASK p 241

3 DKC pp 74 83 84 ASK pp 14 26 162

4 DKC p 93 ASK pp 33 115 119 146

5 ASK pp 24-37

श्रमजलपुलकोद्भेद इवोल्ललास तरलतरस्तारकोद्गमस्तारापथस्य । घनमपि तिमिरमधात गजघटेति मत्वा क्षण न व्यघटन्त चक्रवाकमिथुनानि । बलरज पुन रुद्भवभयलीनतरणिगोपनयेव बद्धमुखानि जज्ञिरे जलजानि । कटुकटप्रकटकोलाहलोद्वेजितानाम उल्लसद्दलपत्राणि श्रवणानीव स्फुटितुमारेभिरे सरसीनामालग्नालिनीलालकानि कुमुदानि । प्रबलबलोरुपीडापीडितभुजवनक्षुभितशोभो गर्भ इव निर्लुलोठ लोहितपाद प्राचीकुक्षे क्षपाकर । "The Day with its brilliance drunk up by the thick dust of the army moved towards the groves of the sunset mountain, putting on the ruddy gown of the crimson sky as though to observe a vow of renunciation on account of its lustre having been first devoured up and then released by the circles of hundreds of royal umbrellas The evening twilight looked like a stream of blood flowing out of the firmament cut up, as it were by the stiff points of hundreds of royal crowns The tremulous stars bore the appearance of drops of perspiration on the surface of the sky, fatigued as it were by its long flight in fear of the flapping of the ears of war elephants The *cakravaka* couples taking the thick layers of darkness for elephant troop did not separate The lotuses shut their mouths (observed silence) as though to guard the sun hidden for the fear of the re emergence of army dust The night lotuses looking like ears of lakes adorned with ear pendants in the form of bees burst into petals, alarmed as it were by the great uproar of the army The reddish moon came out like a phoetus from the womb of the East as if pressed by the heavy military force '[1]

Similarly, on the occasion of Rājahamsa s march for battle, the sun has been likened to the blood of wounded soldiers[2] In another context the morn has been depicted in such a manner as to suit the occasion of the king s regaining consciousness after a long coma As the poet describes भूभुज इव मोहस्तमोराशिरनीयत । परिजनाश्रुसलिलमिव शीतमावश्यायपय । लक्ष्मीप्रत्यापत्तिहर्षादिव मुकुलसंकोचम् उन्ममाथ कमलवनम् । ' the mass of darkness shattered like the swoon of the king dew drops stopped raining like the tears of the train of attendants ,

1 ASK p 71
2 ASK p 52

the bed of lotuses blossomed forth as though in exultation at the restoration of the royal fortune [1] Again, the depiction of the sunset following the re awakening of the sage Marici who recounts his tale to Apaharavarman, resounds well the occasion अथ तन्मनश्च्युततम स्पर्शभियेवास्त रविरगात । ऋषिमुक्तश्च राग सध्यात्वेना-स्फुरत । तत्कथादत्तवैराग्याणीव कमलवनानि समकुचन् । "At this time, the sun set as if in fear of the touch of the darkness (of ignorance) that fell off from the sage s mind the passion (or redness) cast off by him glimmered in the shape of twilight and the beds of lotuses faded away, as if they had colourlessness imparted to them by the tale of the sage filled with disgust [2]

The writer delights also in presenting nature as a fundamental determinant by depicting it in its varied colours and sounds, and often succeeds in attaining rare perfection in the art Of the phenomena presented in this form, the colourful pictures of the sunrise and sunset deserve special notice The rising sun is likened to a ruby peak of the sunrise mountain or to a wreath of golden sprouts of desire granting tree [3] It has also been conceived as a jewelled mirror for the damsel of the East or as decorative painting on her face, or as one of the plump breasts of the maiden in the form of *Saṁdhyā* with red sandal paste applied thereto or again as the central gem of pearl necklace formed by the belt of stars [4] The writer s keen observation of nature is noticed in the depiction of the morning time in the *Avantīsundarīkathā* The poet brings before us the picture with the colour and sound which invest the morn As he observes, the crimson light is spreading over the earth to check the darkness (of night) at the daybreak and is brightening the colour of sprouts and flowers of trees the soft, morning breeze is besprinkling dew drops the flocks of birds are chirping aloud incessantly and are fluttering their wings to get them ready for their journeys to the different quarters the

---

1 ASK pp 135–6 The dew-drops have been compared with the tears in ASKS VI 139 also

2 DKC p 73

3 DKC pp 73 81

4 DKC pp 184 180–1 181 and 180 respectively cp VAs p 224 for first and second *upamānas*

lotuses are smiling, and the night lotuses are closing their eyes [1]

The following picture of the evening sun displays the writer's power of colourful imagination 'The sun, hanging down the sky with its lustre matching the pollen of *kadamba* buds, sped up his chariot, intending to kiss the face of the damsel of *Saṁdhyā* ' [2] Nature paintings are often embellished with poetic figures The following scene of the sunset and the onsetting darkness deserves special notice 'The orb of the sun was reddened as if with blood of its wound caused by its fall from the summit of the setting mountain, the sky was filled with darkness spreading about, as if with the mass of smoke arising out of the burning charcoal in the form of the sun extinguished by his fall into the waters of the western ocean ' [3] Noticeable for its figurative portraiture is also the following picture of the sunset "At the time of the eve, the face of the lady in the form of the Western Quarter was decked with crim son sprouts of diminishing rays of the sun, and the angularities of the roads were levelled with darkness " [4]

More succinct but effective is the following picture of night "The lake of the brilliant lustre of the sun became dry, and there spread about the mud of darkness ' [5] Equally beauti ful is the picture of the passing off of night which as the poet fancies, "was blown away by the force of the breath of the horses of the sun emerged from the ocean The sun rose shin ing with a faint light, as if cold and *sluggish by its stay in the* depth of the cool ocean " [6]

Nature has also been employed as standard of comparison for various objects described We shall have an occasion to refer to the form below, while discussing poetic figures in the

---

1 ASK p 77
2 ASK p 29
3 DkC pp 110-1
4 DkC p 137
5 DkC p *112* अशुष्यच्च ज्योतिष्मत प्रभामय सर । प्रासरच्च तिमिरमय कर्दम ।
6 DkC p 106 महार्णवोन्मग्नमार्तण्डतुरगमश्वासरयावधूतेव व्यापतत त्रियामा । समुद्रगर्भवासजडीकृत इव मन्दप्रतापो दिवसकर: प्रादुरासीत् ।

romances Although Daṇḍin's horizon of natural phenomena is very much limited as compared to that of Kālidāsa or Bāṇa who enjoyed command over a vast and varied landscape of nature, his minute observation of it is certainly commendable in his own limited range He cherishes a real love for varied sounds and colours of nature In his depiction of the quadrupeds and birds and trees and creepers of Vāmadeva s hermitage,[1] we observe his real appreciation of nature and its objects

Of other objects taken up by him, a famine scene has been realistically depicted in *Daśakumaracarita* where he seems to present an eye witness account of the calamity following it As he describes (न ववर्ष वर्षाणि द्वादश दशशताक्ष ।) क्षीणसार सस्यम्, ओषध्यो वन्ध्या, न फलवन्तो वनस्पतय, क्लीबा मेघा, क्षीणस्रोतस स्रवन्त्य, पङ्कशेषाणि पल्वलानि, निर्निस्यन्दान्युत्समण्डलानि, विरलीभूत कन्दमूलफलम्, अवहीना कथा, गलिता कल्याणोत्सवक्रिया, बहुलीभूतानि तस्करकुलानि, अन्योन्यमभक्षयन् प्रजा, पर्यलुठन्नितस्ततो बलाकापाण्डुराणि नरशिर कपालानि, पर्यहिण्डन्त शुष्का काकमण्डल्य, शून्यीभूतानि नगरग्रामखर्वटपुटभेदनादीनि । ' the grains withered, plants failed to seed trees bore no fruit, clouds were empty, beds of rivers became dry, pools were reduced to mud, streams ceased to flow, bulbs, roots and fruits grew scarce, conversations ceased, celebration of religious rites and festivals fell into disuse, thieves and robbers multiplied, people ate one another in hunger, human skulls pale white as cranes, rolled about here and there, flocks of starving crows flew about and cities, villages, towns and hamlets were almost depopulated "[2] It is an effective example of Daṇḍin's descriptive style characterised by simplicity of diction and vividness of the scene The description of some unknown island also is equally picturesque, and is marked by romantic charm the visitor observes अहो! रमणीयोऽय पर्वतनितम्बभाग, कान्ततरेय गन्धपाषाणवत्युपत्यका, शिशिर मिदमिन्दीवरारविन्दमकरन्दबिन्दुचन्द्रकोत्तर गोत्रवारि रम्योऽयमनेकवर्णकुसुम मञ्जरीभरस्तरुवनाभोग । "Oh, beautiful is this mountain skirt, lovelier still is this adjoining ground full of benzoin, cool is this water of the mountain stream marked by circles, spreading

1 ASK pp 141-2

2 DKC p 157

owing to the drops of honey of blue lotuses, charming is the region of the grove of trees with clusters of flowers of various colours '[1]

The descriptive element is more prominent in the *Avanti sundarikathā* wherein Daṇḍin depicts, on the model set by his predecessors, various objects which constitute the regular stock in trade of Sanskrit poets He describes here, for instance the city of Kañci in the embellished *kāvya* manner, marked by the use of a series of figures like simile, metaphor, poetic fancy, paronomasia, apparent incongruity and hyperbole [2] Although the picture presented in such descriptions is vivid, the detail is not serial and systematic for it is the succession of poetic figures which determines the order of the things detailed It may be systematic from the point of view of the employment of figures but it is haphazard from the viewpoint of details included

Notwithstanding the obvious defect in such pictures the description of Magadha country impresses us for its vividness of scenery and fulness of details [3] Its capital Kusumapura has also been depicted graphically The city was encircled by a wide ditch which looked like the ocean agitated, as it were to notice it (the city personified as *a man*) dallying with *his* (the ocean's) consort Ganga A lofty rampart of white hue covered on all sides the city which appeared on that account to be the lunar orbit come down on earth to apprehend the youthful beauty of the capital In an equally figurative manner have been described the big palaces of the city the jewelled festoons over the girdle of the ditch the busy and richly decorated market lanes the round lakes and the spacious gardens The poet here amply displays his power of making the words yield double meaning An example will illustrate the point As describes the writer यस्मिश्च पौरा न बहुभाषिणो बृहत्कथाव्यसनिनश्च न जलाशया सेतुबन्धलग्नाश्च, न प्रमत्तस्पृहा कादम्बरीरसावितृष्णाश्च, न सुरद्विष काव्यदर्शनाभिरक्ताश्च, रामायणविदो रामानुमपातानभि

1 DKC p 156
2 ASK pp 4–7
3 ASK pp 18–9

ज्ञाश्च, दृष्टमहाभारता भीमगदाभिघातवार्तामुग्धाश्च प्रतिवसन्ति । the people of the city interested themselves in the *Bṛhatkatha*, but not in tall talks (*bṛhatkatha*), they were devoted to the *Setubandha* and were wise (not stupid, *jaḍāśaya*) (optionally, they were engaged in constructing a bridge (*setubandha*), but did not come in contact with water, *jalāśayas*) they enjoyed *Kadambarı* and were not arrogant (opt, they drank wine (*kadambarı*) but did not get intoxicated), they studied the science of Poetics (*kavya darśana*) and were friends of gods (opt, they were devoted to Śukra (*kāvya*) the teacher of the *Asuras*, but were not inimical to gods) they were conversant with the *Ramāyana*, but were ignorant of the calamity that befell Rāma (opt *ramās*=women in the society), they had gone through the *Mahabharata*, but were innocent about Bhīma's stroke of *gada* (opt, the terrible spread of the diseases, *gadas*),"[1]

But prosaic and monotonous is the lengthy description of the military march and the Magadha Mālava battle[2] The lengthy detail includes an account of elaborate preparations, various gaits of horses and elephants and of the arming of various divisions of forces and finally of the tough fight between the two troops The enormous description seriously hampers the course of narrative The trite pages which read like some treatise on horse science and elephant lore, present a pedantic information regarding the royal army, though there is no doubt that the writer had an intimate knowledge of courtly life as also of royal military

The personal element is noticeable in his depiction of the devastation caused to the countries of Dramila Cola and Paṇḍya by hostile forces The description which occurs in the auto biographical portion of the work seems to give an eye witness account of the calamity परामृष्टासु कुलवधूषु विरतेष्वग्निहोत्रेषु विलुप्तेषु धान्यकूटेषु विद्रुतेषु कुटुम्बिषु, भिन्नासु मर्यादासु छिन्नास्वारामपङ्क्तिषु, भग्नासु सभाप्रपासु पर्यस्तासु मत्स्यगालासु निहतेषु धनिषु प्रहृतेषु श्रापयेषु । Virtuous ladies were assaulted, performance of sacrifices ceased granaries exhausted householders left their homes bounds of

---

1 ASK p 20

2 ASK pp 65-114

morality were transgressed, rows of gardens destroyed assemblies and water huts dissolved hospitals disarranged, the people plundered and the evil courses followed [1]

Some descriptive portions giving genealogical lists of kings on the Purāṇa model[2] are important neither from the viewpoint of the development of plot nor from that of descriptive art Equally insipid and irrelevant is the description of various gems and pearls and numerous varieties of leather cloth and ornaments, which occurs twice in the work [3] The enumeration of hells and of sins and forms of expiation for them[4] is also lifeless and unessential

The picture of old age drawn by the writer engages our attention for the realistic and emotional touch it contains A deep personal note seems to run through the depiction कष्ट जराभिभूतस्य जन्तोरन्तकसन्निकर्षोपसर्पणभयाद इवोद्वेपन्ते गात्राणि । महाप्रयाण-प्रयासचिन्तावैक्लव्यादिव जायते गात्रसाद । जीवित एव कालदूतागमननिवेद नायम् अन्तर्विशति दृष्टि । अक्षिगूहनहेतुजिज्ञासयेवानुपतति स्थानभ्रशदु स्थिता भ्रू । भूयाऽवयवशैथिल्याद् अचिरधवलरोमजालशबलाया शयनकरसाया कम्बल इव लम्बते चर्मसचय । पञ्जर इव शकुन्तस्यान्तर्श्वासकासिन्या स्फुटी भवत्यस्थिराशि । परिणामदहनदग्धस्य यौवनस्य भस्मेव पलितराशिरत्या सङ्गाद् उत्तमाङ्गेनोह्यते । प्रतिमुखापतितषण्डवाचकयघट्टनान्नि प्रविशीयन्ते दन्ता । प्रेतविषयप्रयाणारम्भप्रहतगम्भीरकांसदुन्दुभिभिर्जीवितस्य मार्गालोचाद्गता इवाप्रत प्रसपन्त्युत्कम्पितरनिस्वानुकम्पणा इव पूतिग न्ध श्वासा । नाप्यानि विकृतरूपमप्रत्यभिज्ञानवतीव स्मृति । अस्यैवमिति व्यपदेशाद अपत्रपमाणेवाप-सर्पत्यपत्रपा । पापीयसी चेयं जरा नामावमानस्य माता धिक्कृतानां धात्री, कार्पण्यस्य भगिनी, भयस्यायति, अभावस्य प्रागवस्था, धर्मस्य विरति, अहङ्का-रस्यावसानम्, अनित्यताया सखी, समोहस्य सतति, अशौचस्यावतारवीथी, नरकवेदनाना पूर्वरूप, शृङ्गारविलसितानाम् अपथ्यभूमि, अनुग्धूननयनमधा करणम् अशक्यवाक्य कणशक्त्यवसादनम अभीमयुद्ध गन्धाभिघातसकुन्तम अ

1 ASK p 12

2 ASK pp 146-9 (Rājahaṁsa s lineage from Soma to Ripuñjaya) pp 183-5 (from Mahāpadma to Ripuñjaya s come back from penance)

3 ASK pp 61-2, 225-7, the pedantic lists are based on Kauṭ II 11 12 cp CSD ch V

4 ASK pp 229 ff

बलामुख तिलकालकप्रसाधनम, ममोघमेतद् मन्तकायुधम् । 'the limbs of an old man tremble as if for the fear of the approaching god of Death his movement is impeded as if owing to the mental worry of imminent final departure his eyes enter deep into their cavities as if to inform the soul of the arrival of Yama s messenger his eyebrows fall down as though wishing to enquire the cause of the hiding of eyes his wrinkled skin, brindled with a net of grey hair, looks like a variegated woollen blanket the lines of bones, manifest on his person give the appearance of a bird s cage, he carries on his head grey hair with care as if they were the sacred ashes of youth consumed by years, his teeth fall out as though in collision with the overpowering old age coming from ahead, his stinking breathings move on as guiding messengers of Death along with deep cough serving as the beating of kettle drum signifying his departure for Yama s abode, memory does not come near, not recognising as it were the body now disfigured bashfulness shuns his face feeling abashed as it were to see his ugly form This wicked old age is, to be sure, mother of humiliation, nurse of contempts sister of frailty, a near relative of fear, a former stage of nothingness, a terminus of fortitude, stopping point of self respect, a friend of mortality, an offspring of infatuation a path leading to impurity, an earlier stage of infernal tortures and a dead stop of erotic pleasures It blinds a man without taking out his eyes, destroys his power of hearing (opt Karṇa, without an utterance of Śalya) torments him with sickness (opt , *gada* without a fighting by Bhīma) disfigures him with dark moles (opt , decorates him with *tilaka* mark and well combed hair) "[1]

Another important description relates to wealth (*lakṣmī*) which has been derided in detail perhaps after the manner of Bāṇa who deprecates it in Śukanāsa's long exhortation to Candrāpīḍa[2] The enumeration of various ominous portents on traditional line[3] may be interesting to a student of cultural history but to a critic of poetry it is all dry and prosaic. Poetically

1 ASK pp 41-2

2 ASK pp 44-8 cp Kād paras 103-8

3 ASK pp 52 4 cp CSD ch VI

important is the brief but lively depiction of foresters' revelry on the occasion of the birth of Rājavāhana and Simhadamana [1] The picture displaying the writer s keen observation and deep imagination presents an interesting form of ancient folk dance Also artistically drawn is the picture of hermitage of Vamadeva with its deep impress of tranquillity and grandeur,[2] though the later part of the detail referring to various kinds of penances is more or less pedantic and insipid There is a fresh glimpse of natural phenomena in the graphic portrayal of birds and beasts and trees and creepers of the holy grove The sublime personality of Vāmadeva and his colleagues adds to the value of the portrait

A number of pictures relate to certain common scenes from Indian life, which have been frequently portrayed by Sanskrit poets One of such scenes depicts the swans attracted by the jingling sound of anklets worn by beautiful damsels [3] Another scene refers to the hitting of red *aśoka* tree by a lady with her foot in order to fulfil its longing at the budding time [4] One such scene typical of Indian life and literature and art presents ladies peeping through the windows of their lofty palaces for catching a hurried glimpse of some royal procession or military march [5]

The foregoing detail makes it evident that the major part of the *Avantisundarikathā relates to a vast fund of descriptive* material both of relevant and irrelevant nature Barring a few exceptions the descriptive digressions interrupt the narrative and obstruct our enjoyment of poetic sentiment

EMPLOYMENT OF POETIC FIGURES

Daṇḍin s poetry rich in delineation of human emotions and feelings, deserves high praise for its intrinsic charm and as

1 ASK p 163
2 ASK pp 138–44
3 ASK pp 11 162 241 cp Hcar p 14 Kir X 4
4 ASK pp 23 25 cp Ragh VIII 62 Megh 75 Mālav III Vās pp 118–9 *Pādatāḍitaka* 100 f
5 ASK p 64, cp Rām II 16 37–41 Buddh III 18–20 Ragh VII 5 11 Kum. VII 62, Kād. paras 80 85, etc cp V S Agrawal HSA p 86

such it is fit for external beautification The ornaments in his poetry enjoy a proper placing His fine aesthetic sense makes him to select the right place for the right thing and we do not find his poetic figures out of place or unfit for the occasion Again, his poetry is richly decorated but it is never over embellished Generally speaking there is no desire for displaying pedantic knowledge and there is no superfluity His employment of poetic figures is natural though ingenious and graceful The figures of sense as compared with those of word occupy predominant place in his scheme of ornamentation We shall refer here to prominent figures of speech adorning his poetry

Simile (*upamā*) reigns supreme in the poetic embellishment of Sanskrit writers, and Daṇḍin happily presents no exception to the rule His similes, the product of his fine imagination, possess the freshness of observation and subtlety of presentation They are lively and artistic the standard of comparison (*upamāna*) in them ably and aptly illuminates the object of similitude (*upameya*) in respect of its action colour and sound with the happy result that they have a pictorial effect on a reader's mind The writer takes his standards of comparison mostly from nature He derives them from a wide range of natural phenomena and, therefore, there is a large variety of pictures of diverse colours and sounds in his poetry A few examples may be cited here Daṇḍin compares the city of Kāñcī well decorated with bright colours (also, unadulterated castes) to the face of the damsel of the East embellished with the painting of streaks of leaves (*pattrāṅguli*)[1] The cloud with a silver lining thereon is a favourite model of similitude with the poet Avantisundarī rests her plump, rounded breasts (*gurupayodharamaṇḍala*) on the bosom of her lover, just as the monsoon spreads the train of heavy clouds (*gurupayodharamaṇḍala*) upon the lap of firmament[2] The princess Ambālikā in confident slumber looks on account of her one side having almost encased in white bedsheet, like lightning lying steadily as it were in exhaustion caused by

---

1 ASK p 4 दिगङ्गनामुखे पत्राङ्गुलिरिव सम्लोऽसवर्णोमिनी ।

2 DKC p 55 also cp KA III 57

its flashing for a long time, on the lap of an autumnal cloud[1] The king, riding a huge elephant and attended on both sides by courtesans seated on side-elephants and swinging chowries gives the appearance of the rain cloud accompanied by the streaks of lightning and attended by the line of cranes soaring along on either side[2] Vasumati separated from her lord, in jungle presents the look of a line of lightning fallen from the lap of cloud[3] Again a white royal umbrella with its golden stick has been compared to an autumnal cloud tinged red with early sun shine[4] A deep, loud voice has often been compared to the rumbling of clouds[5]

Some beautiful similes come from the sun and the moon Dāmodarasvamin having followed Bhāravi attaches himself to the prince Viṣnuvardhana, just as the moon following the solar orbit unites with the new moon day[6] In the battle field Raja hamsa jumps down from his elephant upon blood red ground as the sun leaps down from the western mountain upon the ocean tinged red with evening twilight[7] White silk garments have often been compared with the moonlight[8] A subtle simile occurs when the poet likens the king Rājahamsa, who having offered in gift a thousand milch cows, is marching westward at daybreak to the morning sun, proceeding towards the west, having diffused a thousand rays of ruddy hue, where the *double entendre* in the words *atisṛjya kapilah sahasram ukṣanah* adds to the charm of similitude[9]

Trees and creepers also serve as befitting standards of parallelism The queen Kalpasundarī considers herself to be as ill matched with her husband as the lovely *madhavi* creeper with

1 DKC p 98 cp Kir III 1 V 4 5 VII 8 etc for cloud with lightning as the standard of comparison
2 ASK p 64
3 ASK p 120
4 ASK p 64
5 DKC pp 61 102 ASK pp 57 74
6 Cp ASK p 10
7 ASK p 109
8 DKC p 138 ASK pp 63 158
9 ASK p 72

a bitter *nimba* tree [1] Navamālikā's cheek bearing lines of the drops of perspiration during her fatiguing play with a ball looks like a ripe mango fruit of yellowish white hue, spotted with drops of sap trickled down the broken stem The soldiers horripilation in the battle field has been aptly compared with young sprouts of the *durva* grass [3]

Fauna also supplies some pretty similes The queen Vasumatī robbed of her young child feels distressed like a cow deprived of her calf [4] When the dust of the huge army settles down, the soldiers eyes fall unobstructed on the quarters, just as gazelles move about freely on the grassland [5] Vāmadeva's arms with lines of grey hair resemble old and frail serpents fastened with bits of slough [6] Darkness mangled and turned grey in the later watch of night is finely likened to the hair on the outer corner of an old peacock's eye

At times the poet brings models from spheres other than those of flora and fauna in order to invest his nature paintings with deeper colour The gloom of night gets its standard from the dark spot on Śiva's neck [8] The string of Lakṣmī's side-glances appears as a model for the waves of the ocean, and the whitish cheeks of a loving damsel occur as the standard for *madhuka* flowers (Bassia latifolia) [9] Again the pale cheeks of Śaka ladies come as the original for betel leaf balls and the stream of light [10] The twinkling stars bear resemblance to the glittering drops of perspiration and the sun beams shine forth on the firmament clear after the dust of the army has settled

---

1 DKC p 107 cp *Pādatāḍitaka* 116 पटोलवल्ली समाश्रिता निम्बम् ।
2 DKC p 139
3 ASK p 74
4 Cp ASK p 121
5 Cp ASK pp 69–70 अनिषिद्धप्रचारा हरिण्य इव स्वैरम आरेभिरे हि रेचयितुम् अभिनवदूर्वाश्यामलासु दिक्षु दृष्टयः ।
6 Cp ASK p 145
7 Cp ASK p 158 cp *Pādatāḍitaka* 105 (where it is compared with the dark neck of a peacock)
8 DKC pp 77 137 ASK p 31 also cp Vā pp 161–2
9 ASK pp 14 and 20 respectively cp for the second *upamāna* Mrcch I 57
10. Cp ASK pp 29 60 also cp for the *upamāna* Kād para 17

just as the soldiers, killed heroically flash upon the blemishless hearts of the high spirited men [1] The standards of comparison employed by the poet are both bodiless objects and embodied beings At times, an embodied being appears as *upamāna* for an abstract *upameya*, as for instance, a set of jewelled ear rings comes as a model for the pair of day and night attended by planets and stars [2] Again abstract ideas or feelings serve as standards for embodied or bodiless objects Rajahamsa regains consciousness at daybreak, the poet says that the mass of darkness disappeared like the king s swoon [3]

We come across some fine similes in the depiction of female beauty, to which a detailed reference has already been made We may, however, mention here some striking models for female charms A damsel s eye sparkling with love finds a reflection in a full developed *kandali* bud of deep red hue and the string of her side glances, in a wreath of blue lotuses [4]

The writer also richly draws upon the infinite treasure of mythology for suitable models for objects in hand He brings for instance, Indra's white elephant joyously playing in holy waters of Mandakini as a standard for the king Rajahamsa, with his body besmeared with white sandal sporting in moonlight [5] The burglar Apaharavarman is equated to one of the sons of Sagara in the art of digging a tunnel [6] The surging waves of the ocean, terrific like hoods of serpents touching the portals of the royal palace find an echo in the staff like arms of Rāvana which touched the root of the silvery mount Kailasa in a bid to lift it up [7] The great uproar of the forces spreads about like waters of Narmada dam let free [8]

1 ASK pp 71 and 103 respectively
2 Cp ASK p 95
3 Cp ASK pp 135–6 also cp p 164 where five ladies (wives of the king and his four ministers) have been compared to the five functions of the senses
4 Cp (a) DKC pp 55 (cp Vikr IV 15) (b) DKC pp 74 84 ASK p 162
5 ASK p 33
6 DKC p 95 also cp above ch III
7 ASK p 14
8 ASK p 65

In elaborate descriptions, Daṇḍin employs, like Subandhu and Bana a long chain of similes, often entwined with paronomasia As a typical example, the depiction of Hemakūta, the favourite elephant of Rājahamsa, may be cited here श्रीपर्वत इवेश्वरसभावित कैलास इव राजतात्मा, मन्दर इव सुवर्णशृङ्गो, मैनाक इव स्वपक्षरक्षाक्षमो, मलय इव दक्षिणोद्यत, सह्य इवापरान्तयोगी, विन्ध्य इव शिरस्तटानुमेयकुम्भसम्भवगौरव, हिमशैल इवोदग्रकान्तैकप्रकृति उदय पर्वत इव पुरस्तादुच्छ्रित, सर्वभूधरसमानसारश्चर इवापर पर्वतेन्द्रो निर्मित प्रजापतिना द्विरदेन्द्रो हेमकूट । "The elephant obliged the king (*isvara*) as Śrīparvata honours Śiva (*Isvara*), he was white in complexion like Kailāsa a silver mount, his tusk was of yellowish colour like Mandara, the mountain of golden peak he was capable of defending his side (*paksa*) in war like Maināka mount who was able to preserve its wings (*paksas*), he was courteous (*daksina*) and spirited like Malaya mountain rising in the south (*daksina*) the lower part of his hind feet (*aparānta*) was well formed like Sahya mountain spread over the Aparanta region his forehead indicated heaviness of his frontal protuberances just as the Vindhya peak demonstrates the importance of Agastya he was lofty and agreeable like Himālaya which is exalted and sublime in natural beauty his frontal part was raised up like the Sunrise mount set up high in the east, thus he was created, as it were, by God as the lord of the mountains which, all of them he equalled simultaneously in strength and spirit '[1] But the problem is that the intrinsic beauty of double appropriateness of similitude cannot be repro duced in another language and it can be appreciated only in the original The use of simile with paronomasia attending it, which is a striking feature of Sanskrit poets in general and of the writers of proseromances in particular, tends to become far fetched and obscure, but in Daṇḍin it is seldom so[2]

Utprekṣā (poetical fancy) is another favourite figure of Daṇḍin who employs it finely and elegantly Pramati at the sight of lovely maidens asleep in confidence in the harem fancies them to be heavenly nymphs (who are supposed to be borne

1 ASK p 78

2 Cp ASK pp 5 94 136 for punny similes

just as the soldiers, killed heroically flash upon the blemishless hearts of the high spirited men [1] The standards of comparison employed by the poet are both bodiless objects and embodied beings At times, an embodied being appears as *upamāna* for an abstract *upameya*, as for instance, a set of jewelled ear rings comes as a model for the pair of day and night attended by planets and stars [2] Again, abstract ideas or feelings serve as standards for embodied or bodiless objects Rajahamsa regains consciousness at daybreak the poet says that the mass of dark ness disappeared like the king s swoon [3]

We come across some fine similes in the depiction of female beauty, to which a detailed reference has already been made We may, however, mention here some striking models for female charms A damsel s eye sparkling with love finds a reflection in a full developed *kandali* bud of deep red hue and the string of her side glances, in a wreath of blue lotuses [4]

The writer also richly draws upon the infinite treasure of mythology for suitable models for objects in hand He brings, for instance Indra s white elephant joyously playing in holy waters of Mandakini as a standard for the king Rājahamsa with his body besmeared with white sandal sporting in moonlight [5] The burglar Apaharavarman is equated to one of the sons of Sagara in the art of digging a tunnel [6] The surging waves of the ocean terrific like hoods of serpents touching the portals of the royal palace, find an echo in the staff like arms of Rāvana, which touched the root of the silvery mount Kailasa in a bid to lift it up [7] The great uproar of the forces spreads about like waters of Narmada dam let free [8]

---

1 ASK pp 71 and 103 respectively
2 Cp ASK p 95
3 Cp ASK pp 135-6 also cp p 164 where five ladies (wives of the king and his four ministers) have been compared to the five functions of the senses
4 Cp (a) DKC pp 55 (cp Vikr IV 15) (b) DKC pp 74 84 ASK p 162
5 ASK p 33
6 DKC p 95 also cp above ch III
7 ASK p 14
8 ASK p 65

In elaborate descriptions, Dandin employs, like Subandhu and Bāna a long chain of similes, often entwined with paronomasia As a typical example, the depiction of Hemakuta, the favourite elephant of Rājahamsa may be cited here श्रीपर्वत इवेश्वरसंभावित कैलास इव राजतात्मा, मन्दर इव सुवर्णशृङ्गो, मैनाक इव स्वपक्षरक्षाक्षमो, मलय इव दक्षिणोद्यत, सह्य इवापरान्तयोगी, विन्ध्य इव शिरस्तटानुमेयकुम्भसंभवगौरव, हिमशैल इवोदग्रकान्तिकप्रकृति उदय पर्वत इव पुरस्तादुच्छ्रित, सर्वभूधरसमानसारश्चर इवापर पर्वतेन्द्रो निर्मित प्रजापतिना द्विरदेन्द्रो हेमकूट । 'The elephant obliged the king (*isvara*) as Śriparvata honours Śiva (*Īsvara*) he was white in complexion like Kailāsa, a silver mount his tusk was of yellowish colour like Mandara, the mountain of golden peak he was capable of defending his side (*paksa*) in war like Mainaka mount who was able to preserve its wings (*paksas*) he was courteous (*daksina*) and spirited like Malaya mountain rising in the south (*daksina*), the lower part of his hind feet (*aparanta*) was well formed like Sahya mountain spread over the Aparānta region his forehead indicated heaviness of his frontal protuberances just as the Vindhya peak demonstrates the importance of Agastya he was lofty and agreeable like Himālaya which is exalted and sublime in natural beauty his frontal part was raised up like the Sunrise mount set up high in the east, thus he was created, as it were, by God as the lord of the mountains which, all of them he equalled simultaneously in strength and spirit [1] But the problem is that the intrinsic beauty of double appropriateness of similitude cannot be reproduced in another language and it can be appreciated only in the original The use of simile with paronomasia attending it which is a striking feature of Sanskrit poets in general and of the writers of proseromances in particular, tends to become far fetched and obscure, but in Dandin it is seldom so [2]

Utpreksa (poetical fancy) is another favourite figure of Dandin who employs it finely and elegantly Pramati at the sight of lovely maidens asleep in confidence in the harem fancies them to be heavenly nymphs (who are supposed to be borne

---

1 ASK p 78

2 Cp ASK pp 5 94 136 for punny similes

along the ropes of moonbeams) in faint, being tossed down from the lunar swing [1] The princess Kandukāvatī, returning to her residence after her *kanduka* dance, reverts often her face towards Mitragupta who makes a dainty supposition that she does it all in order to know if her heart that she had sent towards him is returning or not [2] The figure often lends wondrous charm to an otherwise ordinary expression The poet just wants to express Kāñci s superiority over Amarāvati, the city of the gods, in point of wealth and glory, he fancies that when weighed by the Creator in a scale the divine city went up owing to its levity [3] The market lanes of Kāñcī are studded with refulgent gems and pearls exhibited for sale the poet supposes that the strings of Lakṣmi s girdle have broken in vehement love sport and gems from them have scattered all around [4] Rajahamsa bows in reverence before the holy ascetics as though under the excessive weight of the joyous glances that they simultaneously cast upon him [5]

Poetical fancy gives a picture a clearer and brighter look When the dust of Rājahamsa s army settles down the jewelled mirror in the form of the firmament becomes brilliant as though cleaned vivid with the silk of fluttering flags (of the troop) [6] Sometimes the figure deepens the colour of the scenes of nature as for instance in the following description of the sunrise The night passed off as if blown away by the force of the breath of the solar horses emerged from the eastern ocean the sun rose with its light faint, as though rendered sluggish by his stay in the depth of waters The lakes of Kusumapura with intoxicated swans agitating the petals of blue lotuses in the evening have been fancied to be circular pieces of firmament

1 DKC p 139
2 DKC p 153
3 ASK p 6 यया सह पितामहेन तोल्यमाना सारलाघवाद् इवोत्पपात अम रावती ।
4 ASK p 19 cp Bāṇa s *utprekṣā* in a similar scene in Kād. para 44
5 ASK p 144
6 ASK p 69
7 DKC p 106 महार्णवोन्मग्नमार्तण्डतुरगमश्वासरयावधूतेव व्यावर्तत त्रियामा । समुद्रगर्भवासजडीकृत इव मन्दप्रतापो दिवसकरः प्रादुरासीत् ।

with dimly twinkling stars in ruddy twilight [1] The sage Vama deva s long grey beard has been conceived as the mass of foam produced by the churning of the nectar of holy scriptures The following description of Navamālikā also affords a fine example of the figure 'By the breezes of her breath wafting the frag rance of the lotus of her face and causing to dance the tender sprouts in the form of the beaming offshoots of her red lips she kindled as it were to life Cupid that remained as a spark after he was burnt by the fire from the eye of Śiva [3]

We should also refer here to Dandin s *utpreksā* style of description in which art he excels The following fanciful pre sentation of the dust of the army amply brings out his peculiar style स च तुहिननिवह इव शिबिराबलाननकमलानि धूसरीचकार। तत्कमल-ग्रहामर्षादिवोष्णायमानान्यकतेजांसि जग्रसे। तदन्तर्दाहोद्दामतृष्ण इव मदजलानि यथाकाम पपौ। दानसुरापानमत्त इव खड्गधारातलेषु चस्खाल। खड्गक्षत विह्वल इव करिकुम्भस्थलीषु मूर्च्छित पपात। ततश्च समुद्धतकुम्भसिन्दूर-पूको रससिक्त इव कर्णतालतालवृन्तवीजित शनै शनैरुत्पपात। उत्पत्य च व्रणपट्टिकाग्रहणहेतोरिव ध्वजदुकूलचाराण्युपससर्प। ध्वजपटपवनपराहतश्च भूय सुग्रीव स्वरेखारुरोह रेणुसचय । "The dust of the troops as if a mass of mist, rendered grey the lotuses of the bright faces of the camp ladies Then it swallowed up the solar beams which were hot as though with anger on account of its having clouded the lotuses Again, it drank up the temple juice (of war elephants) to the full as if in vehement thirst caused by the scorching sun from within It then slipped on the blades of swords as if in drunkenness on account of over drinking the wine of ichor It fell unconscious as it were on broad temples of elephants as though wounded by the swords Thereafter, it gradually rose up getting mixed with the vermilion of the agitated temples (of elephants) as though sprinkled over with elixir and gently fanned with palmleaf in the form of the flapping of elephants ears

1 ASK p 19 *cp* for another fine fancy regarding the lakes of Kāñcī ASK p 5 (*mathanā*) *āsa* etc)

2 ASK p 143 सकलशास्त्रामृतमथनोद्भूतफेनपिण्डकल्पेन कूर्चकलापेन । cp Kālidāsa (M gh 58) who fancies the silver mount Kailāsa to be the loud laughter of Śiva heaped up

3 DkC p 138 also p 152 for a similar fancy

Having risen up, it touched the silk of flags as if wishing to procure the bandage for its wounds But flung away by the wind of flag silk, the mass of dust ascended the heaven like a virtuous soul"[1]

Metaphor (*rupaka*) also occupies an important place in Dandin's scheme of ornamentation There are numerous examples, in his works of *rupakas*, both complete and partial The following metaphorical comparison of Vasumatī with Mandakini is worth noticing as an instance of *sanga rupaka* (complete metaphor) तरङ्गमयी भ्रूपताकयो, इन्दीवरमयी नयनयुगे, रक्तोत्पलमयी दन्तच्छदे, कुमुदमयीपरिस्मितेषु सौगन्धिकमयी श्वसितेषु, अमृतमयी वचसि, प्रसादमयी मनसि, चक्रवाकमयी पयोधरयो, आवर्तमयी नाभिरन्ध्रे, पुलिनमयी नितम्बतटेषु पुष्करमयी च पादतलयोरमरसद्मन इव राजहंसोपभोगायावतीर्णा मन्दाकिनी देवी वसुमती नाम। (The queen was the heavenly river Mandakini descended as it were on earth in order to provide entertainment for the royal goose (i e Rajahamsa) her flag like eyebrows formed the river s waves, her eyes the blue lotuses her lips the red ones, her gentle smile the night lotuses her breathings the white water lilies her voice ambrosia her mind the clearness of water her breasts a couple of *cakravaka* birds, her navel a whirl pool her hips the sand bank and the soles of her feet the water of the divine stream)[2] Delicate beauty of imagination attends such metaphors as depict the creeper like eyebrows of a damsel as a female dancer of the theatre of the forehead[3] or conceive the bright sun as a playful actor dancing on the stage of the peak of the golden mount Meru or as a lion that destroys the elephant of darkness or again as the jewelled mirror of the damsel of the East[4] Equally beautiful are the metaphors describing the earth as a bride ornamented with the girdle of milky ocean and the necklace formed of the strings of rivers[5] or as a lovely maiden the encircling waters forming her

---

1 ASK p 68 for other examples of the figure cp DKC p 138 (*arunādhara* etc) and ASK p 6 (*śvāsānilavega* etc.)

2. ASK pp 23–4 also cp the vivid superimposition of a deserted forest upon mortal body in ASK p 40

3 DKC p 174 cp KA II 93

4 DKC pp 180–1 184

5 DKC p 180

girdle the thronged mountains, her locks of hair the dense forests her braided tresses, the flowers of different colours, her floral decoration and the sky forming her upper garment of blue silk "[1]

Dandin carefully brings his metaphors to bear upon the tone of the situations he wants to present The king is marching for battle and the dawn is diffusing the rays of the sun in the atmosphere, the poet says that the quiver of the firmament is replete with golden shafts of bright sunbeams Sometimes, his metaphors vivify a comic or happy situation, as, for instance, when the shrewd nurse Śṛgālikā is represented as a life boat rescuing Kāntaka plunged into the deep sea of passion [3]

Among other figures *vyatireka* (contrast) appears in Mitragupta s wishful musings at the sight of the princess Kanduka̅vatī किमिय लक्ष्मी ? नहि नहि । तस्या किल हस्ते विन्यस्त कमलम्, अस्यास्तु हस्त एव कमलम । भुक्तपूर्वा च सा पुरातनेन पुसा पूवराजैश्च, अस्यास्त्वनवद्यमयातयाम च यौवनम । "What, is she Laksmi herself ? No, Lakṣmī holds a lotus in her hand while the very hand of this damsel is a lotus besides, Lakṣmi was enjoyed by Viṣnu as well as by numerous kings of yore while the youth of this maiden is fresh and untainted "[4] In the *Avantisundarīkathā* the poet, deriding the goddess, remarks 'This sordid LaksmI who has defiled the entire form of not only one king but of thousands of monarchs (*isvaras*) cannot be justifiably equated with the *kāla kuṭa* poison which has defaced just the neck of only one *Isvara* (Śiva) [5]

Nidarsana (illustrative simile) occurs when Simhavarman compares a soldier who returns from battlefield without enjoying the revelry of war to a man who evades fortune and other good

1 ASK p 22 चतुस्समुद्रमेखला सकुलशैलकुन्तला सकलकुसुमसंभारभरितारण्यधम्मिल्लबन्धाम् अन्तरिक्षनीलांशुकोत्तरीया विश्वामेव विश्वंभराम् ।

2 Cp ASK p 65 रणोन्मुखस्य राज्ञ कनकनाराचैरिव दारुणैस्तरणिमरीचिभिरम्बरतूणीरधिरापूयत ।

3 DKC p 92 also cp p 175 where the lust of love has been metaphorically described as deep ocean surging with waves of yearnings agitated by the storm of passion

4 DKC p 151

5 ASK p 45

things approaching him [1] The popular device of describing an object by *parisamkhyā* (complete enumeration that excludes everything not specified) comes in the following depiction of the country of Magadha केवलमाक्रीडाचलतलेषूपला । कण्टका कमलनाले ष्वेव दष्टा, धातिष्ठतु पुनरपि दृष्टा प्रियतमानामालिङ्गनेषु । श्रेणि प्रासाद शिखरारोहणेष्वेवासीत् । "Where rocks (*upalas*) existed only at the foot of the pleasure mount (there were no hurdles of any kind in the kingdom) thorns were noticed only on lotus stalks and in the embraces of lovers (in the form of horripilation) and different gradations existed only in staircases leading to the terrace of lofty palaces (there were no differentiating grades in the society) [2]

Another familiar device of descriptive style consists in the subtle employment of the figure, *virodha* (apparent contradiction), generally attended by paronomasia We come across a clever use of the device in the following description of Kusumapura यस्मिश्च पौरा न मधुपायिनो दानरुचयश्च, न कृशानुगामिन प्रकटित भूतयश्च, न भगुरभोगवृत्तयो भोगिनश्च, सत्रविरोधैकायतनम अधिवसन्तो निर्विरोधरमणीयम अभ्यस्यमानपुण्यकर्माणि प्रतिवसति । "Wherein the citizens indulged in drinking but did not take wine (apparent contradiction being avoided by taking it to mean that they were fond of making gifts and did not take wine) they did not enter fire (opt did not follow the weak minded people), yet they manifested ashes (opt, prosperity) they did not possess curved coils (opt, did not follow the path of transitory enjoyments) yet they were serpents (opt they led an enjoyable life) They led a life of constant opposition (opt, of paradoxical elements) yet they lived in perfect peace and plenty [3] Equally subtle example occurs in the delineation of Lakṣmī 'She is not Yaśodā, but brings up Balarāma (opt does not bring glory to a man though raises him to power) she is not Subhadra, though draws Vijaya (Arjuna) to herself by her agreeable qualities (opt, she is not auspicious though attracts victory) she is not Damayantī though she accepts Nala discarding the regents of the

1 ASK p 74 see text and trans above pp 336-8
2. ASK pp 18-9 also cp ASK p 8 (description of the king Siṁhaviṣṇu) also cp KA II 319-20 (the examples of *śleṣa*)
3 ASK p 20 also cp above pp 364-5

quarters (opt she is not of chastising nature and holds lotus flower in preference to the real protectors of people) [1] Beautifully conceived is the contradiction that Rajahamsa though composing well the various colours (*varnas*) made the world all white with his fame the contradiction being removed by taking it to mean that the king established well the four castes (*varnas*) and thereby spread his glory in the whole world [2]

The figure *dipaka* has also been nicely illustrated at places as, for instance, in the description of the spy disguised as an ascetic who was emaciated both by anxieties and religious observances and whose countenance was clouded both with the dust of the path and by sufferings [3] An effective illustration of the figure occurs in the description of Vasumati s attempt to enter fire on the loss of her son Hamsavahana who had been taken away by a swan Vasumati argues with her ministers who request her not to end her life, in the following words भस्तु खल्व तिमलीमसानामधिकनिष्ठुरस्वभावाना लोहजातीना तदतिशायिनीना च मद्विधानामन्यनारीणा मलशोधनाय देवो हुताश एव मे शरणम् । 'Let the fire god serve as a proper refuge for the iron impure and very much hard as well as a woman like myself who is even more impure (wretched) and still harder than the iron, and let him purge us of our impurity (or wretchedness)' [4]

Danḍin's employment of paronomasia (*sleṣa*) is subtle, but not obscure The figure occurs in the accompaniment of almost all important figures as we have noticed above His power of effecting double appropriateness without much torturing of the language is unique [5] Other striking features of his ornamentation are his fine and fertile imagination and a rare quality of succinctness which invest his poetic figures with life and colour

Of verbal figures which also have been employed by the

1 ASK p 45 also cp the description of H makuta (*ib* p 78) of cavalry (p 94) of enemy forces (pp 100–1) of Vamadeva (p 144) etc for the device

2. ASK p 21 also cp for the figure ASK pp 52, 144 160 etc

3 ASK p 38 cp Hcar p 165 for a similar description of Yasomati

4 ASK p 122

5 Also cp ASK pp 27 (*gurun api* etc and *jalamadhve* etc) 45 (*saiṣa mandarod bhuta* etc) and 144 (*amuṣmimś ca* etc.) for fine specimens of paronomasia

writer with equal skill and force *anuprāsa* (alliteration) is the sweetest and the most favourite with him Fine and melodious verbal music characterises his *anuprāsas* The following instances may give an idea of the magic charm of his sweet and pleasing series of words for which his poetry is particularly known (दण्डिन पदलालित्यम्) (1) मयुग्मशर शरशयने शायपिष्यति ।, (2) क्षरितनीहारे निजनिलयनिलीननि शेपजने निशान्तशीते निशीथे , (3) जन चैन सह नयानया कन्यया कन्यागृह हरिणनयनया ।, (4) यस्मिश्च भूभुजि भुञ्जति भुजस्तम्भेन भुव भोगभङ्गो भुजगमाना न च भुजगमा ।, (5) ईदृश्या तु तत्र साधो प्रतिरूपया प्रतिपत्त्या प्रहृन प्रहारवर्मा प्रियसुहृत प्रवासेऽपि प्राणान् न पयत्यजत् ।[1]

Another verbal figure with equal pleasing effect is *yamaka* to which the writer attaches much importance both in theory and practice[2] A few instances of the figure may be cited below (1) पातितश्च कोपितेन कोऽपि तेन शाप ।, (2) सत्कारेण नीरजसा नीरजसाध्यशालिनि सहर्षालिनि सरसि सरसिजदलसन्निकाशच्छायस्य , (3) मदगन्धविदग्धविशारदे शारदे , (4) प्रवरवर्णिन्या वरवर्णिन्यामजायतासौ निधि । (5) वसुमती वसुमतीव समुद्रमेखला सलेव च कमलवासिनी, (6) न ववर्ष वर्षाणि द्वादश दशशताक्ष ।[3]

Daṇḍin also displays his skill in difficult verbal feats or *tour de forces* as, for instance, when he ventures to write the entire seventh chapter of the *Daśakumāracarita* without a single labial letter The feat, which illustrates his own verbal figure *sthānaniyama*,[4] has been carried out to the end with amazing skill and success though we must admit that there is, in some cases, torturing of words or farfetchedness of sense, resulting in obscurity and confusion We may here refer to the unusual words coined with a distinct view to avoiding vocables with labial letters, such as *saṃsthitajanadahasthana* for *śmaśāna*

1 Cp (1) DKC p 84 (2) DKC p 172 (3) DKC p 176 (4) ASK p 8 (5) ASK p 172 for other striking instances of alliteration cp App IX
2 Cp above pt II ch VII
3 Cp (1) DKC p 60 (2) DKC p 184 (3) ASK p 32 (4) ASK p 179 (5) ASK p 133 (6) DKC p 157 for other instances of the figure cp App IX
4 KA III 83 ff cp III 88 for an instance of verse without labial letters Keith (HSL p 306 fn) notes that Pindar wrote a poem without *s*

(cemetery), *sitetaradīdhitideha ja* for *Yama* (god of Death), *daksi nadahanasārathi* for *Malayānila* (Malaya breeze) *antahsamcari satatagati* for *prana* (breath) *nisthāngārarajas* for *bhasman* (ashes), *salilataranasādhana* for *pota* (ship) *cillikā* for *bhru* (eye brows) *janasya asya* for *mama* (my) etc

The tale of Somadatta in the *Avantisundarikathā*, which portion is now lost in the work, must also have been an equally fine example of *svaravarnaniyama* (restricted use of vowels and consonants) [1] The story in the *Dasakumaracarita* also, which we get in the spurious *Purvapīthikā* today might have illustra ted the restricted use of vowels and consonants as we find it in the *Kathasāra*

LANGUAGE DICTION

The writer has perfect command over the use of language which is usually simple and forceful, though we have traces here and there of his desire to strain language especially when he chooses to display his verbal jugglery A large number of artificial conventions and superfluous devices prevailed in Dandin s time both in poetry and prose His works (and parti cularly his *Dasakumāracarita*) are fortunately free from this fatal element of artificiality to a considerable extent Generally speaking he avoids lengthy and complicated constructions and his syntax is well formed and logically arranged with no defect of looseness or immaturity In his peculiar style of syntactical organisation consisting in the formation of short sentences arranged in quick succession he achieves the desired object of rendering a situation or scene more effective As a typical example of his fluent and forceful diction the following passage may be cited here भद्र काद्य त प्रतिपत्ति '' इति । सोऽभ्यधत्त—'न शक्नोमि चैनामत्र पित्रोरनभ्यनुज्ञायोपयम्य जीवितुम । अतोऽस्यामेव यामिन्या देशमिम जिहासामि । को वाऽहम् ? यथा त्वमानापयसि' इति । अथ मयाक्तम

---

1 Cp ASKS VII 14 cp for the feat KA III 83 ff also cp above pt I ch II pt III ch III An instance of *svaraniyama* may be noticed in the ASK p 152 भगवानमुमापन्नगारणमसुरवरकरणक्रन्दनपरममरमुनिमनुजे मग्नगिवनह्नगगनमयतनुमतनुतनुमलघमलघुमचरमचरमपर परमहोनाय नम ।

—'अस्त्येतत । स्वदेशो देशान्तरमिति नेय गणना विदग्धस्य पुरुपस्य । किंतु बालयमनल्पसौकुमार्या, कष्टा प्रत्यवायभूयिष्ठाश्च कान्तारपथा । शैथिल्यमिव किंचित प्रज्ञासत्त्वयोरनर्थनिदर्शेन देशत्यागेन सभाव्यत । तत्सहानया सुखमिहैव वस्तव्यम । एहि नयावैना स्वमेवागारम ।' इति । '(I asked him) 'good man, what course of action you mean to adopt? He replied, I shall not be able to reside in the city with safety upon marrying the damsel without the consent of her parents I, therefore propose to leave the city this very night Or rather, who am I to decide? I will follow your advice I said It is as you say, living in one s native land or in a foreign country is no consideration with a man of talent But this maiden is tender and the paths through wilderness are very difficult, and abound in obstacles, and again such an aimless abandonment of native place means something like want of wisdom and spirit on one's part You should therefore, just live here happily with her Come let us conduct her to her own house [1]

The *Avantisundarikatha* also presents such instances, though very rarely, for it patronises an altogether different language and diction A passage however illustrating the writer s simple and fluent diction may be cited here अथवा, नैव जानात्याभिजात्य प्रियाद्यल्लापयितुम । इच्छदयास्मत्प्रियहितपिणा मानसारेण मालवेष्वेव सनिपत्याहवशिरसि तत्सन्देशवस्तुन प्राप्तरूप प्रतिव्याहरिष्यामि । अथवा पुण्यतम प्रयागाद्देशस्तत्रैव नस्समागमोऽस्तु । काम च वासरोऽयमननुकूलस्तदपि न कार्याराधनक्षम । कालक्षेपो मङ्गलतिथिनक्षत्रेष्टत्व हि । अनोऽद्यैवाभियोगाय सनह्यता सै यम उद्घुष्यता प्रयाणाय पटह इत्युपरचिताञ्जलिम उपस्थित बलाध्यक्ष हृपनामानमादिश्य । दूत महत्यायपूजया योजयित्वा हृष्टवर्ण यथादिष्टनिवेदनायाग्रे विससर्ज । स्वय च सनद्धनप्रणाम विसर्जित राजलोक सिंहासनादुत्तस्थौ । 'Or rather noble birth knows well how to make one speak pleasant words I wish to make a befitting reply to his message in the field of battle in the Malava country when come face to face with him Or better it is that the two armies meet in war in the holy region of Prayāga And though the day is not auspicious but the important task brooks no delay It is sheer wastage of time to think of congenial days and stars Just today therefore get ready for war, the

1 DKC p 80

battle-drum for military much may be beaten forthwith Thus he ordered the Chief Commander named Harsa, present there And having provided the envoy with the honour of much wealth, he despatched him back He dispersed the group of feudatories and got up from his lion seat in order to procure necessary equipment for the fight [1]

Sometimes he succeeds in producing the desired effect by repeating a word with a view to emphasising some particular point as for example in सुभगम्मन्यमानेन च मया स्वधनस्य स्वगृहस्य स्व गणस्य स्वदेहस्य स्वजीवितस्य च सर्वेश्वरीकृता । "I who considered myself blessed made her the mistress of my wealth my house my retinue, my body and even of my very life Similarly invested with force is the simple statement about Laksmī दुर्लभा च दुरभि-रक्षा च क्षणिकशीला च खलैकवल्लभा च निष्करुणा च निष्कारणविलोभनी चाललक्षणा लक्ष्मी । *"The evil Laksmi (wealth) is hard to obtain* and also difficult to retain, she is of low character and loves only the wicked she is cruel, she allures people without cause [3] Often does the writer stress his point with the word *visesatah*, as in, दुरभिरक्षतया तु दुहितॄणां मुक्तशैशवानां विशेषतश्चामातृकाणाम् । "It is difficult to guard daughters that have passed the stage of girlhood and more particularly those that have no mother [4]

In order to emphasise a particular situation he changes his diction in consonance with the tenor of the context and renders it more effective and forceful with the help of his peculiar manner of presentation The following words of Dhanamitra who wishes to express his deep sense of gratitude to Apahāravarman are sufficiently capable of conveying his meaning स्वर्गेवेयमस्या निशि प्रिया मे दत्ता वाक्पुनर्ममापहृता । तथा हि न जाने वक्तुम् । त्वत्कर्मैतदद्भुतमिति, इदं ननु ते स्वशीलमद्भुतवत् प्रतिभाति । नैवम् अन्यापि कृतपूर्वमिति, प्रतिनियतैव वस्तुशक्तिः, न हि स्वयमन्यदीया शोभा दय । त्वयाद्य साधुनोन्मीलितेति, तत्प्रायशस्त्वदृतेऽवदानेभ्यो न रोचते । दृष्ट मित्रानीनोऽशयस्य स्वरूपमिति, स्वदागमनमनुमान्य न युक्तो निश्चय । त्वया-

1 ASK pp 58–9

2 DKC p 74

3 ASK p 50 (cp Kād. para 231 for emphatic use of *ca*) also cp DKC p 71 (*nibatibalān nu* etc) p 84 (*kim vilāsāt* etc)

4 DKC p 146 also cp pp 164 165 ASK p 218 for this peculiar manner of emphasising a point also cp Mrcch III 16 f Kād. para 229

मुना सुकृतेन क्रीतोऽयं दासजन इति, असारमतिगरीयसा क्रीणासीति स ते प्रज्ञाधिक्षेपः । प्रियादानस्य प्रतिदानमिदं शरीरमिति, तदलाभे निधनोन्मुखमिदमपि त्वयैव दत्तम् । अथवैतावदत्र प्राप्तरूपम् । अद्यप्रभृति भवतोऽयं दासजन इति ।
"You have given me my beloved this night but have deprived me of my speech For I do not know what to say If I say that this your act is wonderful (it would be superfluous, for) your character itself appears to be something marvellous If I say that this has never been done by any other before, then it might be urged that power of things is fixed in each individually, for avarice and such other things which are found in others are absent in you If I say that today you have displayed what saintly character is it would not agree with your previous acts mostly of such nature If I say that today is seen the real nature of nobility, it would not be reasonable to arrive at such a decision without having consulted your estimate of it To say that you have bought this slave by this good act is an insult to your wisdom, as it amounts to saying that you bought a worthless thing for an extremely valuable one If I were to say that I offer my body to you as a return gift, it would not be reasonable for my body is virtually a gift from you as it would have perished had I not obtained my beloved Or this much will be proper for me to say on this occasion—from today this your slave should be supported by you "[1]

Idioms and phrases if they are pithy and well formed play a vital role in contributing to the beauty of language When sententious and pointed parts of popular conversation are transmuted from the folk tongue to a poet s pen, they become fine gems of poetic art The skill in the art presupposes a unique sense of worldly wisdom and poetic imagination Daṇḍin is proficient in the art he finely observes worldly usages and absorbs them skilfully into the work of imagination His poetry is full of precious gems of lively terse and pointed idioms and phrases which lend unique charm to his language [2]

We may also discuss here Daṇḍin s language with reference to the poetic dictions expounded by him in the *Kavyādarśa* He

---

1 DKC pp 79–80

2. Cp for a list of idioms and phrases App

patronises the Vaidarbha diction his predilection for which is also vindicated by his high praise of Kālidāsa for his having established that path as a pioneer [1] Again he refers to the arrangement of high sounding and forceful letters and also of sweet and perspicuous syllables and commends such a diction for the pleasing effect it produces [2] The verse which elicits the above reference to elegant diction in the romance runs as follows दनुजपतिहृदयभूधरविभेदविज्ञातशक्तिनखकुलिशम । जगदुदयहेतु विष्णोरवतु वपुर्नारसिंहं व ॥ (May Viṣṇu's form as Man lion whose *power of adamant nails was well exhibited in his cutting asunder* the mountain like heart of Hiranyakaśipu and who is the cause of the rise of the universe, protect you all !) The verse happily illustrates the Vaidarbha diction with its excellences, force, sweetness and perspicuity, referred to in the comment thereon in the work We shall briefly see here how the writer embodies the ten excellences of the Vaidarbha path in his works

His diction is characterised by perspicuity of meaning (*prasāda*) He employs words in their conventional meanings easy of comprehension Of course there is in his works a large number of new vocables which appear to be unusual or obscure usages, but they have certainly been taken, and taken directly, from popular diction and not from lexicons We shall note them subsequently while dealing with his vocabulary

Equally prominent in his works is the excellence *madhurya* or sweetness which refers both to word and sense With regard to the elegance of sense which implies absence of vulgarity, it may be confessed that the writer often offends our delicate sensibility, as we have discussed above though it is futile to apply strictly the modern measure stick of delicacy to his romances The elegance of words consisting in the peculiar word sequence with alliteration and *yamaka* is what is generally termed *padalalitya* or the beauty of words for which the writer has won a deserved name [3] The excellences *sleṣa* consisting

---

1 Cp ASK intro v 15 येनेद वर्त्म वैदर्भं कालिदासेन शोधितम ।

2 ASK p 9 अत्र कस्यैतान्यक्षराणि विकटबन्धान्योजस्वीनि च सदयान्ते कस्य चेन वर्णरचना माधुर्यवती प्रसन्ना चेन्दुकरकलितेव श्रवणानन्दमुत्पादयति ?

3 Cp the present writer's paper on Daṇḍin's *padalālitya* in *Viśvasamskṛtam* IV, 2 (Feb 1967) pp 147-51

in compactness due to abundant use of unaspirated letters *sukumāratā* formed by a profusion of soft letters and *samatā* (evenness of diction) also constitute elegance of diction (*pada lālitya*) The excellences *prasāda* and *arthavyakti* also indirectly help the realisation of felicity of diction, for the verbal elegance cannot be fully relished and appreciated in the absence of perspicuity and explicitness of expression The writer is conscious of the charm of the music of words he describes the poetry of his great grandfather as *lalitapadavinyāsa* having the composition of graceful diction[1] Besides the extracts which we have noticed above as fine instances of *anuprāsa* and *yamaka*, the following passages aptly illustrate his sheer beauty of words

1 किरणजालकरालरत्नराजिराजितराजाहसिनाध्यासी यथासदाचारदर्शिन शङ्कायन्त्रिताङ्गान् सनिधिनिपादिन सहायानगादिपम ।

2 स एवायमव्याजजयार्जितोर्जितप्रभाव प्रभावावधूतवैवस्वतवरुणवज्रहस्त राजराजो राजा राजसिह ।

3 राजहसीविनम्बिविक्रमललितनितम्बिनीक्म्बवनितम्बविम्बप्रलम्बितमञ्जु शिञ्जानकाञ्चीदामा काञ्चीपुर नाम राजधानी ।

4 निशि निशि निशाकरार्चिषि नीरन्ध्रा धकारकणनिकरनिगीर्णन्शदिशि निद्रानिगडितनिखिलजनन्शि ।

5 मध्यमस्तु तथा मनोरथो मनोरथ इव चिरेणोपपन्न धमस्य माहात्म्यवतो महितमहाशन्नोघपूरितान् महीमन्मानितान मर्यादारक्षणो चितान महागुणरत्नराशिभाजो महासत्त्वान् महोदधीनिव मध्यमो लोक-श्चतुर सुतानलभन ।

6 सुभगमन्येन च मया स्वधनस्य स्वगृहस्य स्वगणस्य स्वस्नेहस्य स्वजीवितस्य च सैवेश्वरीकृता ।

7 प्रज्वलत्सु ज्वलनेष्वात्रप्रणीतासु प्रलीयमाना प्रलयाय पेतु प्रलघुपात पतन्ना ।

8 रक्षितयमुष्मिन न लेशोऽपि लोभस्य, लवोऽपि लाघवस्य कणिकाऽपि कार्पण्यस्य, क्षोदोऽपि क्षुद्रभावस्य, शकलमप्यकुशलस्य, रजोऽपि राज्यदाहस्य प्रजाभिरन्वायन ।

9 देव, देवप्रसादादेव ।

1 ASK p 10

10 भार्गव रविमिवे दु ।[1]

On the basis of the scheme of letters of words Daṇḍin refers to three kinds of sequences, namely, soft, hard and middle[2] We notice the three *bandhas* in his diction though the soft and hard *bandhas* have rarely been represented in his works He also admits in practice the importance of *samata* (evenness of diction) and there is hardly an instance where he develops suddenly soft sequence into hard one and *vice versa*

Of other excellences *samadhi* and *ojas* require special mention The writer is fond of metaphorical expression which chiefly constitutes the *guna*, *samādhi* A few instances of the excellence may be cited here (1) अश्रुबिन्दुतारकितपयोधरा (काम मञ्जरी) ('Kāmamañjari, with her breasts bestarred with large tear drops') (2) त्वरितप्रवर्तितस्य इने सन्ध्यामुखचुम्बनाभिलाषिणि (दिवसकरे) (The sun sped up his chariot as if in eagerness to kiss the face of the damsel of twilight), (3) चिरविलसनखेदनिश्चला शरदम्भोधरोत्सङ्गशायिनीं सौदामिनीम् । (lightning lying exhausted on the lap of an autumnal cloud')[3]

The quality of *ojas* consisting in the employment of a profusion of compounds which the writer regards as the soul of prose[4] stands unique in his works The various forms of the excellence are richly illustrated in them Broadly speaking we may divide the *guna* into two varieties namely, *vyasta* (diffused form) and *samasta* (compressed one) The former consists of short sentences with compounds of smaller length, occurring here and there while the latter is composed of just opposite elements The following examples from the two works may illustrate the diffused (*vyasta*) form

1 'अम्ब, किं ब्रवीमि ? दौर्भाग्य नाम जीवन्मरणमेवाङ्गनानाम्, विशे

---

1 Cp respectively DKC p 184 ASK pp 131 6 DKC p 180 ASK p 11 DKC p 74 ASK pp 103 154 DKC p 93, ASK p 10 Also cp the famous ex of *yamaka* from the PP (p 23) कुमारा माराभिरामा रामा-द्यपौरुषा रुषा भस्मीकृतारयो रयोपहसितसमीरणा रणाभियानेन यानेनाभ्यु-दयाशंस राजानमकार्षुः ।

2 KA I 47 cp above pt II ch IV

3 Cp (1) DKC p 65 (2) ASK p 29 (3) DKC p 93 also cp ASKS VIII 94 and KA I 98

4 KA I 80 see above pt. II ch. IV

पतश्च कुलवधूनाम । तस्याहमस्म्युदाहरणभूता । मातृप्रमुखोऽपि ज्ञातिवर्गो माम वज्ञयैव पश्यति । तेन सुदृष्टा मा कुरु । न चेत्यजेयमद्यैव निष्प्रयोजनान् प्राणान । ग्रा विरामाच्च मे रहस्य नाश्राव्यम् ।' इति पादयो पपात । सैनामुत्थाप्योद बाष्पोवाच—'वत्से माध्यवस्य साहसम् । इयमस्मि त्वन्निदेशवर्तिनी । यावति ममोपयोगस्तव तावति भवाम्यनन्याधीना । ' Mother, what can I say? The condition of being hated by one s husband is certainly a living death and particularly in the case of ladies of high birth I myself am a fitting instance of this all my relatives including my mother treat me with contempt Make me therefore, one loved by all, and if it is not possible here shall I end my unneeded life And this my secret should not be divulged until I die" With these words, she fell at her feet The old woman raised her up and with tears in her eyes said "Dear girl, do not go in for such a rash act, here am I ready to do your bidding I am entirely at your service, as long as I can serve you in any way "[1]

2 अविश्वास्यता हि ज नभूमिरलक्ष्म्या । यावता च नयन विना न याति लोकयात्रा स लोकत एव सिद्ध । नात्र शास्त्रेणाय । स्तनधयोऽपि तैस्तै रुपायै स्तनपान जनन्या लिप्सते । तदपास्यातियन्त्रणाम् अनुभूयन्ता यथेष्टमिन्द्रियसुखानि । येऽप्युपदिशन्ति—'एवमिमिन्द्रियाणि जेतव्यानि एवमरिषड्वगस्त्याज्य, सामादिरुपायवग स्वेषु परेषु चाजस्र प्रयोज्य, सधिविग्रहचिन्तयव नेय काल, स्वल्पोऽपि सुखस्यावकाशो न दय' इति, तैरप्यभिमि त्रबकयुम्मत्तश्चौर्यार्जित धन दासीगृहेष्वेव भुज्यते । And mistrust is the birthplace of disaster To what extent the course of worldly existence can proceed without policy is seen from our usual experience of daily life No need of scriptures in this matter even a suckling manages to get milk from its mother by various means Let then all restraint alone and enjoy pleasures of sense according to wish Even those who say— Thus should the senses be subdued the six natural foes shunned and the expedients of conciliation and others be employed with reference to allies as well as enemies all the time should be spent in deliberations of war and peace and not the slightest room should be allowed to pleasure',—the cranes of counsellors spend whatever money they manage to

1 Cp DKC pp 164-5

pilfer from you in the brothels "[1]

3 न मां स्निग्धं पश्यति, न स्मितपूर्वं भाषते, न रहस्यानि विवृणोति न हस्ते स्पृशति न व्यसनेष्वनुकम्पते, नोत्सवेष्वनुगृह्णाति, न विलोभनवस्तूनि प्रेषयति, न मत्सुकृतानि प्रगणयति, न मे गृहवार्तां पृच्छति, न मत्पक्ष्यान् प्रत्यवेक्षते, न मामासन्नकार्येष्वभ्यन्तरीकरोति न मामन्तःपुरं प्रवेशयति। अपि च मामनर्हेषु कर्मसु नियुङ्क्ते मदासनमन्यैरवष्टभ्यमानमनुजानाति, मद्वैरिषु विश्रम्भं दर्शयति, मदुक्तस्योत्तरं न ददाति, मत्समानदोषान् विगर्हयति मर्मणि मामुपहसति स्वमतमपि मया वर्ण्यमानं प्रतिक्षिपति महार्हाणि वस्तूनि मत्प्रहितानि नाभिनन्दति, नयज्ञानां स्खलितानि मत्समक्षं मूर्खैरुद्घोषयति। 'He has no longer affectionate look for me he does not address me with a smile does not disclose his secrets to me, does not touch my hand does not sympathise with me in my misfortunes and does not oblige me in festivities He no longer sends me any hand some gifts takes no notice of my good deeds he never asks after my family, nor has a regardful look for my associates he never admits me to his inmost secrets nor ever gives me an access to harem But on the contrary, he appoints me to disagreeable duties and allows my seat to be occupied by others he evinces confidence in my opponents never condescends to reply to my questions holds up to ridicule those whose offence is similar to mine, laughs at me so as to prick my vital parts rejects even his own opinions when set forth by me does not receive with joy even the precious gifts offered by me and makes fools proclaim in my presence the errors of politicians

4 अस्यैव च दुरात्मनः कृतघ्नस्य कृते परभवनद्वारस्थगलप्रहाराननुभवन्ति।

गात्राणि सङ्कोचयन्ति मस्तकेन महीं मसृणयन्ति, दास्यमप्युपगच्छन्ति, उच्छेषणम् उपभुञ्जते, साधूनपवदन्ति माहात्म्यमपह्नुवते मित्राण्यभिद्रुह्यन्ति, गुरूनधिक्षिपन्ति, प्राणान् विक्रीणन्ते स्तेयमाचरन्ति मायां प्रवर्तयन्ति वृद्धिमुपजीवन्ति। तदेवमेतदनल्पातिप्रयासपरंपरावध्यमानमप्यवरस्मादेव क्षुद्रसत्त्वमिव विभज्यते। नोपलालितं गणयति, नानुवृत्तिमवबुध्यते न पश्चात् पश्यति, न बहुमानं मन्यते। सुलभविनाशकारणत्वाच्च निषेक एव व्यापाद्यते, गर्भ एव वा स्रवति, गर्भीभूतमेव वा जायते, जातमात्रमेव वा नश्यति, शैशव एवोपरमति। '*For the sake of this very wicked and ungrateful*

---

1 DKC pp 193–4

2 DKC p 195

body, people suffer seizure by the throat by doorkeepers of others' houses, contract their limbs, smoothen earth with their forehead, undergo even abject slavery, eat the leavings of others deride good people, plot against friends insult elders, sell their lives, commit theft, practise frauds, live on interest

However brought up with great efforts it (the body) breaks down like the friendship of the wicked it cares not for caressing or fondling or loving affection and values not honour Easily perishable it is destroyed even during impregnation or is aborted or is born dead or dies just after birth or passes away while still in infancy) [1]

5 किमनया नाचरितमिन्द्रजालेषु किमनभ्यस्तं प्रलम्भनेषु, किमु शेषितं महापातकेषु किमगणितमकार्येषु किमप्रवर्तितं वर्णसंकरेषु किमभिन्नं मर्यादासु, किमनुद्भावितं मोहविलसितेषु, किमप्रतिहतं जालवर्त्मसु? रज्जुरियमुद्बन्धनाय सत्यवादितायाः विषमिव जीवितहरणाय माहात्म्यस्य, शस्त्रमिव विशसनाय सत्पुरुषवृत्तानाम् अग्निरिव निर्दहनाय धर्मस्य, सलिलमिव निमज्जनाय सौजन्यस्य धूलिरिव धूसरीकरणाय चारित्रस्य। What among the magic deeds this Laksmi has not performed ? What fraud she has not practised ? What sin she has not committed ? What evil course she has not trodden ? Which of the bounds of morality she has not infringed ? What among the pranks of infatuation she has not manifested ? And which of the fraudulent means she has not employed ? She is a veritable rope for binding up truthfulness, poison for killing the spirit of greatness a weapon for striking at the conduct of good people, fire for consuming righteousness water for drowning benevolence and dust for soiling pure character

The *samasta* or compressed form also is richly illustrated in his two romances and especially in the *Avantisundarikathā* Some typical examples may be quoted here

1 अथ कदाचिदायासितजायारहितचेतसि, लालसालिलङ्घनग्लानघन केसरे, राजदरण्यस्थलीललाटलीलायितनिलके, ललितानङ्गराजाङ्गीकृतनिनिद्र-कर्णिकारकाञ्चनच्छत्रे, दक्षिणदहनसारथिरयाहूतसहकारचञ्चरीककलिके, काला-ङ्गजकण्ठरागरक्तरक्ताधरारतिरणाग्रनाहनालिनि, शालीनकन्यकान्तकरण-

---

1 ASK pp 40-1

2 ASK p 47

सञ्जातरागनद्धितलज्जे, दर्दुरगिरितटचन्दनाश्लेषशीतलानिलाचार्यदत्तनाना-लतानृत्तलीले काले कलिङ्गराज त्रयोदश श्रीणि च दिनानि सागरतीर कानने क्रीडारसजातासक्तिरासीत । 'Then once (in the vernal season) when the hearts of separated lovers languished when the thick-grown *kesara* flowers faded under the descent of bees greedy of floral juice, when *tilaka* the sportive mark of the broad forehead of forest groves was all in bloom when the full blown *karnikāra* flower formed the golden umbrella of the lord of Love, when the Malaya breeze produced blossoms on the mango trees which attract swarms of bees when the cooings of *kokila* birds eminently prepared the impassioned women for the field of amorous sports, when all sense of bashfulness was overridden by the passion of love rising in the minds of modest girls and wherein all creepers were taught to dance gracefully by the instructor, the breeze cool owing to its contact with the sandal trees on the slopes of the Dardura mountain the king of Kalinga, having got a passion for sport passed thirteen days in the grove by the sea shore [1]

2 स स्थविष्ठनिष्ठुरै कण्टकजाल करालितेन तपःप्रभावप्रकर सगीर्णविघ्नविनायकदशनचूर्णैरिव कुसुमरेणुभिमरुदुद्धूतैः पलितपाण्डरशिरसेव महता जीर्णकेतकीवनेन परिवृतम्, उत्क्षिपद्भिरिव शिखरलम्बिजलधरकुलम म्बरसरित्प्लावनाय दर्शयद्भिरिव नन्दनवनोद्देशं शाखानिलीनशकुनिशावकानुमद भ्रमर तपस्यावासप्रासादैरिव कुसुमपाण्डुभिर्वनस्पतिभिरुपशोभितम र्जितजनध्यानासनवधपूतवेदिकासनाथनलैर्दर्शितशिलाभङ्गैव धचतुरश्रालवालकै

कुसुमरजःकदम्बनिर्भर्त्सितपक्षपालिना मधुलिहां कुलेन सदयपरिपीय मानमकरन्दै लतामण्डपैरुपेतम, अञ्जलिपुटमभितोपजातवीजतण्डुलैर्लोल-कपिलकाकपक्षैर्वैखानसकुमारकै सनाहूयमानशावकानुसरणलग्नहंसीपरित्यक्त पङ्कजास्वादरागया शान्तशमदया नमस्योपगूढकपास्वम् आश्रम पदमपश्यत् । "He saw therein the holy grove encircled with an old *ketakī* forest made formidable by thick and pricking thorns with its top looking grey with floral dust wafted by the air as if with the powder of Gaṇeśa s tusk swallowed up by the power of austerities, made charming by the big trees yellowed with blossoms, which tossed up clouds hanging on their tops as if in

1 DKC pp 176-7

order to make them drink the heavenly waters and presented a look of Nandana garden by their boughs birds and drunk bees and looked like palaces for the residence of austerities (The holy grove) was endued with creeper bowers the floor of the bowers was furnished with dais made pure by the meditating postures of fire sacrificers the square watering trenches were dammed with pieces of rocks The bowers were humming with swarms of bees with their wings f...ing on floral dust (Again, the sacred grove) was embraced on one si... by the river Nar mada the giver of calm shelter where female ge... ...ese discarding sweet lotuses followed their young ones who were ... being invited with gestures by the *Vaikhanasa* boys with their bro... ...wnish locks of hair fluttering in the air holding rice corns in the... ...ir hollowed hands [1]

3 अधिकचतुरश्चारिता। भ्रुवम अविरलचरणनि... कुञ्चनक्व णितनूपुरम आविद्धाकुलकुसुमदामधम्मिल्लबन्धम् असकृदाकुञ्चि... ...चनप्रसारि ताञ्चितोत्क्षिप्तभुजननावलम्बितोत्तरीयम आरेचितनितम्बफलकवाचा... ...नमेखलम आन्दोलितक्वणपाशलोलकुण्डलावघट्टितासम अनवधानस्खलितपादविपर्... ...नलयम आयासश्वासभिन्नगीतरागम, आवर्जितपृथुपयोधरहारम आरब्धान... ...दिनृतया अनतशबरीसहस्रमध्यवर्तिया विन्ध्यसेनया [2] ' Vindhyasenā was d... ...hancing along with thousands of *śabaris* with her eyebrows cast ...ut swiftly on all sides her anklets tinkling on account of incessant ...f move ment of her feet her braided hair tied around her head fli... ...gl nging abo... ...pper g... ...ntly c... ...ed out bent and raised up the girdle u... her playful hips resounding with its own noise her shoul... being incessantly struck with tremulous ear ornaments swin... to and fro, the rhythm of the dance being sometime irreg... caused by a slip of foot the musical mode being at times ... turbed on account of exhaustion and the necklace hanging... her plump breasts being repeatedly bent [2]

Between the two extremes stands the intermediate which is represented abundantly in the two romances W...

1 ASK pp 138–9
2 ASK p 163

below two typical examples of the *ojas* of this variety, one each from the two works

1 एष्वेव दिवसेषु काममञ्जर्याः स्वसा यवीयसी रागमञ्जरी नाम पञ्चवीरगोष्ठे सङ्गीतकमनुष्ठास्यतीति साद्रादर समागमन्नागरजन । स चाह सह सख्या धनमित्रेण तत्र संन्यधिषि । प्रवृत्तनृत्यायां च तस्यां द्वितीय रङ्गपीठ ममाभून्मन । तद्दृष्टिविभ्रमोत्पलवनशरणापाश्रयश्च पञ्चशरो भावरसाना सामग्र्यात् समुदितबल इव मामतिमात्रम् अव्यथयत । अथासौ नगरदेवतेव नगरमोषरोषिता लीलाकटाक्षमालाशृङ्खलाभिर्नीलोत्पलपलाशश्यामलाभिर्माम् अबध्नात् । "Just at this time, as Rāgamañjarī, the younger sister of Kamamañjarī was to give a musical concert at the public hall, the citizens, full of eager curiosity, assembled there I was present there with my friend, Dhanamitra When she commenced dancing, my mind became, as it were a second stage ground for her to dance Cupid taking refuge in the excellent bow in the form of the lotus bed of her amorous glances and gaining strength, as it were on account of the display of feelings and sentiments in their entirety tormented me exceedingly Thereupon she bound me with the chains of a series of her sporting side glances, dark blue like the petals of blue lotuses as if she were the presiding deity of the town incensed at my thefts in the city [1]

2 प्रशान्ते च कलकले सकले स दण्डिनमवादीत्—'अस्ति किंचिद्विज्ञाप्यम् । अवसिता एव सर्वे नित्यप्रमादशैथिल्याभ्यां शिल्पातिशया । यतोऽद्य त्वेव प्रयोगलेशोऽपि विस्मयाय लोकस्य । युष्मादृशां तु महेन्द्रपराशरप्रभृति प्रणीतशास्त्रहृदयवेदिनां कियदिवैतस्मिन्नैपुणमपि । तदनुग्रहायमेव केवलमनुमहा-मल्लपुरम् उत्तरङ्गहस्तसंवाह्यमानपादपङ्कजस्योर्मिमालिनो भगवतो भुजगवर-शयनम् अनुगृह्णन् शैलस्य शार्ङ्गधन्वन केनापि कारणेन मणिबन्ध एव भग्नो दक्षिण कर । स तु मया प्रतिघटित । किमसाववनिमहद्भि पूर्वाचार्यैस्तस्या दिग्गाङ्गनैघटितायाः अनुरूप घटते न वेति द्रष्टुमर्हथ । न हि व शक्यमस्मादृशाम् असाधारणेनाभ्यर्थितमकृत्वा स्थातुम् ।' इति । 'And when the confused oise came to an end, he said to Daṇḍin 'I wish to make a re uest to you The excellent forms of art have now ceased to ist owing to our constant negligence and idleness for today, aten an insignificant performance of this sort amazes the people's

---

[1] DKC pp 83–4

mind But to men like you who know the essence of the works composed by Brahman Indra, Parāśara and others, even the perfection in this art is nothing very much impressive I, therefore, beseech you to bestow a favour on me There is, along Mahāmallapura on the sea shore, a stone statue of the God Viṣṇu whose lotus like feet are being shampooed by the ocean with its hands in the form of surging waves, and who is resting on the bed of excellent serpent (Śeṣa) its right arm was broken at the point of wrist That I have repaired Please be kind enough to see and examine whether it is worthy of the divine form fashioned by the great teachers of yore You can not possibly do without acceding to my earnest solicitation) '[1]

It should be clearly admitted that there is abundance of lengthy compounds in the *Avantisundarikathā* as compared with the other romance which is chiefly occupied by short compounds, and the fact seems to have brought about a big gap in the diction of the two works, though they closely illustrate the statement of the *Kavyādarsa* which divides *ojas* into different varieties according as the compounds are rare or numerous[2]

LANGUAGE GRAMMAR VOCABULARY

Knowledge of grammar which has been conceived as the mouth of literature[3] is essential for a writer who wants to make his poetry acceptable to the learned men of taste Daṇḍin refers in his *Kāvyādarsa* to the defect of faulty grammar in poetry, and holds up Vyāḍi in his *Avantisundarikatha* to ridicule for his ignorance of the science[4] In the latter work, he punningly employs various grammatical terms, such as *pratyaya-vidhi karaka, vibhakti, vacana vikāra agama, upasarga, abhyasa guna vṛddhi* etc in the description of the courtesans of Kāñcī[5] He exhibits his profound knowledge of grammar in his works which contain a large number of peculiar words and forms of grammar giving the inevitable impression that he laboriously

1 ASK p 13
2 KA I 81 see above pt II ch IV
3 Cp *Pāṇinīyaśikṣā* v 42 मुखं व्याकरणं स्मृतम् ।
4 Cp KA III 125 ASK pp 180–1
5 ASK p 7

took them from the grammatical writings Some such words and forms and usages of grammatical importance are as follows समूलकाष कषन्त, असिघात घ्नन्त, जीवग्राह गृह्णन्त, पशुमार मारयन्त, जीवनाश नश्यत, पूपवाह वाहयन्त, पार्श्वोपपीड शाययन्त उरप्पेष युध्यमानान, अक्षिनिकाण प्रहसन्त, यष्टयुपघात कालयित्वा, अजावरोध स्थापयन्त, नीचैः-कारमालपन्त, नामग्राहमाह्वयन्त पाषाणशुष्कपेष पिष्ट्वा, धनपोष पुष्टा, ऊध्वशोष शुष्यन्तीम् पाणिदर्शं जिघासन्त, ऊरूपपीड भुजोपपीड चोपगूह्य etc (all forms with *namul*)[1] असूर्यंपश्या कूलमुद्रुज, सुमगम य, सुन्दरमन्य etc (all forms with *khaś*),[2] आचारचुञ्चु–, पटुजातीय– शूलाकृत्य, निष्कुलाकृत्य, सपत्राकृत–, निष्पत्राकृत– मद्राकृत– सवकर्मीण–, अभ्यमित्रीण– (all peculiar *taddhita* forms)[3] and क्षिणोति च पुरा स कृतघ्नो भवन्तम् (peculiar use of the present tense with *purā* in the sense of near future)[4] etc

He is particular about grammatical accuracy in his romances[5] There are, however, errors at some places[6] But as he himself remarks in his *Kāvyādarśa* (III 151), such errors do creep in, in the works of poets who are generally not very particular about the observance of the subtle rules of the science of words His syntax is generally simple and well formed At a few places, however there is defective syntax as in (1) मरीचि कृच्छ्रवेशादुत्याय पुन प्रतितप्ततप प्रभावप्रत्यापन्नदिव्यचक्षुषम उपसगम्यतेनास्म्येव भूत त्वद्दर्शनम अवगमित, (2) प्रियसखीं दिदृक्षु प्रियंवदा वसुमतीं सह भर्त्रा पुष्पपुरम् अगमत्, (3) पुनरहम् अभिलिख्यात्मन प्रति

---

1 ASK pp 169–70 also cp pp 87 201 228 DKC pp 121, 136 155 cp Pāṇ III 4 26–64

2 ASK pp 17 30 DKC pp 74 92 cp Pāṇ III 2 31 36 83

3 ASK p 139 DKC pp 190 202 208 ASK pp 98 151 DKC p 209 cp Pāṇ V 2 26 3 69 4 61–7 V 2 7 17

4 DKC p 129 cp ASKS VII 46 cp Pāṇ III 3 4 His frequent use of aorist and perfect forms also shows his knowledge of grammar for these forms esp cp DKC pp 56–9 ASK pp 24–9

5 He is particularly credited with the correct use of the perfect in describing what is not part of one s personal experience in the four episodic tales in DKC VI and that of other past tenses in the prince s narratives cp Keith HSL p 307

6 Agashe has laboriously detected grammatical errors in DKC cp pt I ch I

कृतिम् प्रस्मत्प्रतिकृतिरमुष्यै नेया, (4) प्रव्यपिष्ट च दृष्टवैव स मा नारीजनः ।[1]

Many of these mistakes may be attributed to scribal negligence

Daṇḍin's vocabulary is considerably vast. He derives freely vocables from various sources including literature, lexicons, grammatical and other scientific writings and, above all from the world around him In his romances there is a good deal of words and phrases which have been drawn directly from the common usage or spoken language of the time, and this constitutes a striking feature of his diction Only a small number of words seems to have been exclusively derived from lexicons and scientific writings We may have an estimate of his vast treasure of vocables by referring to the words and phrases representing common usage of the age occurring in a single episodic story of Gominī they are *nalipṛṣṭha* (back of a pestle), *darvi* (ladle) *sthalī* (a cooking utensil) *śurpa* (winnowing basket), *culli* (hearth), *mukhapidhana* (lid) *ulukhala* (a mortar), *bhṛṅgāra* (a jug) *śarāva* (an earthen platter), *karaka* (a small waterpot) *gandhaśali* (fragrant paddy), *annamaṇḍa* (scum), *peya* (water gruel mixed with some boiled rice) *sūpa* (sauce) *upadamśa* (condiments), *trijātaka* (cinnamon oil) *kalaśeya* (curd churned with a handle, without water), *kāñjika* (sour gruel) *kana kimśaruka* (grains of dust and the awn) *praślathavayavatandula* (rice with its grains loosened) *mukulavasthā* (the state of a bud of rice) *samapakvasiktha* (grains equally boiled) *lavanasambhara* (adding salt to anything) *angāradhupavāsa* (scenting of sauce etc with perfumes evaporated on charcoals), *ślakṣnapiṣṭa* (finely pulverised), *mṛdu mṛdu ghaṭṭayanti* (moving pestle softly) and *agarudhupadhupana* (fumigating with the incense of black aloe wood)[2]

The long list also indicates the writer's keen observation of life around him and his rich expression of it Equally interesting is the list of the instruments of burglary, which comprises of *phanimukha* (a scoop) *kakali* (whistle) *samdamsaka* (tongs) *puruṣaśirṣaka* (a sham head) *yogacurṇa* (magic powder) *yoga*

---

1 Cp (1) DKC pp 100-1 (2) DKC p. 103 (3) DKC p 107 (4) DKC p 134

2. DKC pp. 159-63

vartika (magic wick) *mānasutra* (measuring thread), *karkaṭaka* (a wrench), *rajju* (a rope), *dīpabhajana* (a lamp-case) and *bhrama rakaraṇḍaka* (a box containing a bee to put out light)[1]

Some other peculiar words many of which seem to have come from the contemporary life are (1) *ardhoruka* (a garment reaching half down to the thighs), (2) *aśmantaka* (a hearth), (3) *upahastikā* (a small purse containing betel leaf and its ingredients) (4) *uragāsya* (a scoop), (5) *aikāgarika* (a thief) (6) *ausira* (bed and seating chair), (7) *kaṇḍapaṭī* (canvas curtain), (8) *khar vaṭa* (a small town) (9) *goruta* (distance of a cow's bellowing) (10) *cāraka* (jail), (11) *janghakarika* (a courier) (12) *dṛti* (a leather bag), (13) *nivī* (money box), (14) *pañcaviragoṣṭha* (public hall), (15) *puṭabhedana* (a town), (16) *vangerikā* (a cane basket), (17) *malamallaka* (a strip of cloth for covering privities), (18) *muṣitaka* (stolen things), (19) *sapharuka* (a casket for ornaments), (20) *hasantikā* (a portable fireplace), (21) *kandu* (sauce pan), *śreni* (a bucket) (23) *caṣaka* (a cup) (24) *goni* (a sack), (25) *patadgraha* (spittoon) and (26) *karaṇḍaka* (betel leaf box)[2]

Again there are some words and phrases and meanings conveyed thereby which are characteristically Daṇḍin's own, as for instance (1) *yogya* (rehearsal) (2) *utkalikā* (eagerness), (3) *jaivatṛka* (one of long life) (4) *gatayus* (wretched) (5) *nicāyya* (having seen or ascertained) (6) *sakhāgrahikayā* (catching hold of the branches), (7) *samapattidṛṣṭa* (seen accidentally) (8) *cit trīyā* (admiration), (9) *cillikā* (eyebrow) (10) *pragetana* (to be performed in the morning), (11) *śrovasiya* (happiness) (12) *su bhagammanya* (considering oneself blessed), (13) *rajñe preṣa ṇiyam* (you should send a message to the king) (14) *prasṛta* (dispersed) and (15) *upari* (after)[3]

* * *

---

1 DKC p 77

2. Cp (1) DKC p 77 ASK p 241 (2) DKC p 87, (3) *ib* p 144 (4) *ib* p 134 (5) *ib* p 95 (6) *ib* p 100 (7) *ib* p 131 (8) *ib* p 145 157 (9) *ib* p 147 (10) *ib* pp. 59 95 (11) *ib* p 58 (12) *ib* p 203 (13) *ib* p 77 (14) *ib*. p 83 (15) *ib* p 157, (16) *ib* p 94 (17) *ib* p 74 (18) *ib* p 80, (19) ASK p 36 (20) *ib* pp. 34 35 (21) *ib* p 233 (22) *loc cit* (23) *ib* pp. 32, 33 78 (24) *ib* p 70 (25) *ib* p 29 (26) *ib* pp. 56 236 DKC p. 99 such words shall come in for a detailed study in CSD

3. Cp. (1) KA II. 243 (2) III. 11 (3) DKC p 103 (4) *ib* p 101 (5) *ib*

From the foregoing study of Daṇḍin with reference to his art and style in the two romances, it follows that he was a great writer of India who enriched the sphere of prose *kāvyas* in Sanskrit with his unique contribution in the form of giving a new genre to the literature in his *Dasakumāracarita* and excellently representing the literary tendencies of the age in his later romance He compares well with his great predecessors, Subandhu and Bāṇa in point of happy delineation of the sentiments of love and heroism, picturesque depiction of nature, successful realisation of fine and forceful diction and perfect command over language though he may not claim the former's power of subtle employment of pun in every syllable or the latter's fertile imagination and elaborate diction On the other hand, he excels them in point of gradual development of plot with smooth and easy flow of narrative unobstructed by lengthy digressions, unfolding of human character with a marked emphasis on its weaknesses, felicitous delineation of the comic sentiment with a subtle sense of wit and humour, keeping even balance between matter and manner and putting equal emphasis on ideal and verbal embellishment There might have been critics in older time who felt reluctant to recognise the great achievements of his poetic art and style for he did not follow slavishly the literary conventions of the age and boldly discarded the tradition of a theme with noble heroes in his prose *kāvyas* which are virtually romances of rogues There was certainly a class of his admirers who highly valued his poetry for the great merits referred to above Noted especially for his unique quality of the felicity of diction he is traditionally ranked among the greatest writers of Sanskrit namely, Kalidasa, Bhāravi and Māgha उपमा कालिदासस्य भारवेरर्थगौरवम । दण्डिन पदलालित्य माघे सन्ति त्रयो गुणा ॥ Another tradition recorded in the *Suktimuktavali* places him by the side of Bāna as a writer overwhelming other poets by his unique poetry दण्डीत्युपस्थिते सद्य कवीना कम्पतां मन ।

---

pp 120 179 182 (6) *ib* p 81 (7) *ib* pp 146 158 (8) *ib* p 151 (9) *ib* p 174 (10) *ib* p 81 (11) *ib* p 65 (12) *ib* pp 74 92 (13) *ib* p 130 (14) *ib* p 64 (15) *ib* p 168 The word *upara* meaning *thereafter* still occurs in Marathi as *upara* cp M R Kale notes also cp Nir I 20 II 6 etc Also see idioms and phrases App X

प्रविष्टे त्वन्तर बाणे कण्ठे वागेव रुद्ध्यते ॥[1]

According to still another tradition, his name comes as one of the three great poets of India, the other two being Vālmiki and Vyāsa जाते जगति वाल्मीकौ कविरित्यभिधाऽभवत् । कवी इति ततो व्यासे कवयस्त्वयि दण्डिनि ॥[2] Although the statement is obviously an exaggeration, it does show the high esteem the writer was held in Equally interesting is the certificate said to have been awarded to our poet by the Goddess of Muse (Sarasvatī) कविर्दण्डी कविर्दण्डी कविर्दण्डी न संशय, while giving her verdict on the question as to which of the two poets, Kālidāsa and Daṇḍin, was a real poet, though she supplements her judgement by adding the words त्वम् एवाहं न संशय (you are verily my own self) for Kālidāsa It is of no small significance that the eulogy equates him with Kālidasa, the greatest poet of Sanskrit literature Still another tradition records an incident of *samasyā purana* in which Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti and Daṇḍin take part[3] These traditions though unhistorical are important inasmuch as they indicate a great popularity of our writer who has been ranked in them with the brightest luminaries of Sanskrit literature

Gaṅgādevī s high eulogy of Daṇḍin s poetry is also worth citing here आचार्यदण्डिनो वाचाम् आचान्तामृतसम्पदाम् । विकासो वेधस पत्न्या विलासमणिदर्पणम् । 'The blossom of Daṇḍin s speech soaked in ambrosial sap is the jewelled mirror of Sarasvatī[4]

It is unfair to say that these encomiums might have been exclusively based on Daṇḍin s lost work or works and that the works extant do not deserve them, for, the present romances of the writer are fully worthy of the above eulogies which were of course, inspired by his *Dvisamdhanakāvya* also now lost to us The solitary stanza of the work which attempted a simultaneous narration, with the help of *śleṣa* a figure of double appropriateness of the stories of the two Epics may well give an idea of how the great writer succeeded in his difficult endeavour उदारमहिमा राम प्रजानां हर्षवर्धन । धर्मप्रभव इत्यासीत् ख्यातो भरतपूर्वज ॥

1 'There was a king named Rāma, elder brother of

---

1 Cp II 11
2. Sūkt IV 75
3 Cp above, pt I ch IV, also see Kale intro to DKC p xiv
4 Cp MV I 10

Bharata, of great magnanimity, bestower of happiness on his subjects and known as the source of righteousness'

2 'There was a famous king (Yudhiṣṭhira), a descendant of the Bharatas and the son of Dharma, who was bestower of happiness on his subjects and was a garden so to say, of great magnanimity'

Modern scholars willingly accept Daṇḍin's greatness as a writer of Sanskrit prose According to A B Keith, "though Indian taste would never have ranked his style with that of the *other great romancers it is greatly to be preferred on modern* standards "[1] As S K De observes "the highest praise goes to Daṇḍin as the master of vigorous and elegant Sanskrit prose'[2] With reference to his *Daśakumāracarita*, the same scholar re marks that "in its artistic and social challenges it is undoubtedly a unique masterpiece the great merits of which need not be reluctantly recognised by modern taste for not conforming to the normal model "[3] In fact Daṇḍin occupies an important place in Sanskrit literature as a writer of prose fiction by virtue of his unique qualities of creating wonderful tales constructing well knit plots with swift and easy going narratives vivid characterisation and pointed caricature felicitous expression of senti ments, unparalleled blending of reality and romance power of picturesque description and mastery over language and to cap it all the quality of elegance of diction (*padalalitya*)

He made a rich contribution to the *kāvya* literature in Sanskrit by creating a new genre in the field of prose and by making it a forceful medium of expression in Sanskrit Again, he made an equally great contribution to the science of Poetics by giving a thoroughly analytical treatment to the various con cepts of the science, and in this field also he enjoys a prominent place among the early writers of the Sanskrit Poetics

1 HSL p 307
2 HSL p 217
3 *Loc cit*

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

PASSAGES SHOWING IDEAL OR VERBAL AFFINITY BETWEEN KA AND DKC

(Cp pt I, ch I, p 9, fn 6)

1 Cp KA I 63 कन्ये कामयमानं मां न त्वं कामयसे कथम् । with DKC p 116 अयि मुग्धे, क सचेतनः स्त्रियमभिकामयमानां नाभिनन्दति ?

2 Cp KA I 64 कामं कन्दर्पचाण्डालो मयि वामाक्षि निर्दयः । त्वयि निर्मत्सरो दिष्ट्या with DKC p 115 अत्र स्थाने एव त्वां दुनोति मीनकेतुः । मां पुनरनपराधम् अधिकम् आयासयतीत्येष एव तस्य दोषः ।

3 Cp KA II 93 मुखपङ्कजरङ्गेऽस्मिन् भ्रूलता नर्तकी तव । लीलानृत्यं करोति with DKC p 174 चिल्लिकालतां ललाटरङ्गस्थलीनर्तकीं लीलालसं लासयन्ती ।

4 Cp KA II 151 सहिष्ये विरहं नाथ देह्यदृश्याञ्जनं यथा । यदक्तनेत्रां कन्दर्पः प्रहर्तुं मां न पश्यति ॥ with DKC p 153 अस्ति किंचिदञ्जनम् । अनया तदक्तनेत्रया राजसूनुरुपस्थितो वानरीम् इवैनां द्रक्ष्यति ।

5 Cp KA II 263 मदर्पितदृशस्तस्या गीतगोष्ठ्यामवर्धत । उद्दामरागतरला छाया कापि मुखाम्बुजे ॥ with DKC p 83 (पञ्चवीरगोष्ठे) प्रवृत्तनृत्याया च तस्या द्वितीयं रङ्गपीठं ममाभूत्मनः ।

6 Cp KA II 266 राजकन्यानुरक्तं मां रोमोद्भेदेन रक्षकाः । अवगच्छेयुरां ज्ञातमहो शीतानिलं वनम् ॥ with DKC p 78 आपतच्च नागरिकबलम् । शयञ्च भाविनविपवेगविक्रिय ।

7 Cp KA III 52 उपोढरागाप्यबला मदेन सा मदेनसा with DKC p 171 नाथ, त्वद्दर्शनाद् उपोढरागा तस्मिन् कन्दुकोत्सवे । Also cp p 89 यदहम् उपोढम ।

8 Cp KA III 57 उरस्युपास्तीर्णपयोधरद्वय मया समालिङ्गयत

जीवितेश्वर । with DKC p 55 उरस्थल चेदम् आलिङ्गयितुम इति प्रियोरसि प्रावृडिव नभस्युपास्तीर्णगुरुपयोधरमण्डला ।

9 Cp KA III 58 सभा सुराणामबलाविभूषिता गुणैस्तवारोहि मृणालनिर्मल । स भासुराणामबला विभूषिता विहारयन् निर्विश सपद पुराम् ॥ with DKC p 194 किं बहुना, राज्यभारम् अन्तरङगेषु समर्प्य अप्सर प्रतिरूपाभिरन्त पुरिकाभी रममाणो गीतसगीतपानगोष्ठीश्च यथर्तु बध्नन् कुरु शरीरलाभम ।

10 Cp KA III 90 अनङ्गलङ्घनालग्नानातङ्का सदङ्गना । and III 142 पश्याम्यनङ्गजातङ्कलङ्घिता तामनिन्दिताम् । with DKC p 177 रणदलितसकलाङ्घितनततता and p 179 अखिलनरेन्द्रयत्र लङ्घितस्चण्डताराग्रहा ।

11 Cp KA III 127 विचार कर्कश प्रायस्तेनालीढेन किं फलम् । with DKC p 205 यथापि मञ्जुवादिनीरागलीनदृष्टिलीढधैर्येणाभिहितम् ।

APPENDIX II

PASSAGES WITH IDEAL OR VERBAL AFFINITY FROM DKC AND ASK

(Cp pt I, ch I, p 18, fn 1)

1 Cp DKC p 55 तदारम्भस्फुरितया च रागवृत्त्या भूयोऽप्यावतत रतिप्रबन्ध । with ASK p 173 मद्दानस्फुरितरागेण वेगोपश्लेषित यौवन ।

2 Cp DKC p 63 देव, दृष्टिदानेनानुगृह्यताम् अयम् आज्ञाकर । with ASK p 90 इतो दृष्टिदानेनानुग्रह क्रियताम् ।

3 Cp DKC p 70 नायकामो धनस्य शततमीम् अपि कला स्पृशत इति । with ASK p 151 अग्रामवासिनो वनकामस्य यादृगायासपरिस्पन्दस्तस्य शततमीम् अपि कलाम् अरण्यवासिन ।

4 Cp DKC p 81 पुरीतल्लतापरीतदन्तकाण्ड (हस्ती) with ASK p 192 वृन्तपुरीतत्परीतदन्तकोटि (वनकुञ्जर) ।

5 Cp DKC p 89 यतो हम् एकदा रागमञ्जर्या प्रणयसमर्पितमुख-

मधुगण्डूषम् आस्वादम् आस्वाद मदेनास्पृश्य । with ASK p 33 असावपि प्रियतमोपाहृताननवनजवारुणीगण्डूषपानरक्तगण्डो मन्दाकिनी पयसि विजहार ।

6 Cp DKC p 98 उपरि कपोलादर्शतलनिषिक्तचित्रवितानपत्रजाति जनितविशेषकक्रियम् with ASK p 33 कपोलसङ्क्रान्तच द्रचन्द्रोदय इव स्मितोद्गम, and p 115 कपोलादर्शसङ्क्रान्त ।

7 Cp DKC p 98 शरदम्भोधरोत्सङ्गशायिनीम् इव सौदामिनी राज कन्याम् अपश्यम् । with ASK p 64 अभ्रमालोत्सङ्गिनीभि सौदामिनीभि (वारयुवतिभि), also cp p 120 जलदोत्सङ्गाद् भ्रष्टां सौदामिनीम् इव (अतिकरुणदशना राजमहिषीम्) ।

8 Cp DKC p 110 मदुपभुक्तमुक्ते रत्नतल्पे । with ASK p 188 तदुपभुक्तमुक्तम् उपवनम् ।

9 Cp DKC p 122 पारतल्पिकम् उपधियुक्तम् अपि दुष्टामित्रप्रमापणाभ्युपायतया राज्योपलब्धिमूलतया च पुष्कलावधर्मावप्यरोरधत् । with ASK p 239 अतश्च प्रीतिरुत्तमा वैरनिर्यातनाच्च धर्मार्थौ च पुष्कलौ स्वाम्यर्थसाधनाद् भवन्तम् अभ्यावर्तेरन् ।

10 Cp DKC p 123 आयसपरिघपीवराभ्या भुजाभ्याम् with ASK p 173 आयसपरिघनिष्ठुरेण बाहुना ।

11 Cp DKC p 123 मणिभङ्गनिर्मलाम्भसि मणिकर्णिकायाम् with ASK p 222 हरिन्मणिभङ्गवर्णवारिणि सरसि ।

12 Cp DKC p 124 (मत्तहस्ती) मण्डलितहस्तकाण्ड समभ्यधावत् । with ASK p 192 वन्यकुञ्जर कोऽपि कुण्डलितहस्तकाण्डोऽभिपत्य प्रहृत्य ।

13 Cp DKC p 141 निरलक्तकरक्तपाटलेन दन्तच्छदेन with ASK p 27 अपास्तालक्तकं दशनच्छदकिसलयं ।

14 Cp DKC p 150 अतोऽनया सुदृष्टं कारयित्वा त्यक्ष्यामि प्राणान् and p 164 तेन सुदृष्टं मा कुरु । with ASK p 51 सुदृष्टश्च क्रियता जनोऽयम ।

15 Cp DKC p 153 मङ्कुरितघर्मसलिलदूषितकपोलपत्रभङ्ग with ASK p 36 अविरलघर्मवारिविप्रदूषितविशेषकन्याम । Also cp p 26 कर्पूरचूर्णविमुच्यमानधर्मस्विन्नकुचतटानि ।

16 Cp DKC p 156 पद्मरागसोपानरश्मिभि (शोणीभूत सर) with ASK p 19 मणितटरश्मिजालसंदिग्धवारिभि सरोभि ।

17 Cp DKC p 163 माधुर्यप्रकर्षविजितरसनेन्द्रियस्तदच्छं पानीयम् आकण्ठं पपौ । with ASK p 222 आवर्जितरसनेन्द्रियम् वर्णकम् ।

18 Cp DKC p 178 सारसश्रेणिशेखरस्य सरसः with ASK p 18 सारसकलहंसावतंससरसविकटतटाकमण्डला (मगधा) Also cp p 222 सरसि सारसावतंसे ।

19 Cp DKC p 189 आगमदीपदृष्टेन खल्वध्वना सुखेन वर्तते लोकयात्रा etc with ASK pp 38 9 आगमानुसारप्रवृत्ता च बुद्धिरनुगच्छति सर्वत्रैवावकाशम् । आकाशेऽपि विचरति etc

20 Cp DKC p 189 सतोरप्यायतविशालयोर्लोचनयो with ASK p 124 धवलायतविशालमक्षियुगलम् ।

21 Cp DKC p 193 शकुनानि चाशुभानि, शान्तयः क्रियन्ताम् । with ASK p 60 दुर्निमित्तशमनदृष्टशक्तयः शान्तयः क्रियन्ताम् ।

22 Cp DKC p 193 ब्रह्मकल्पा इमे ब्राह्मणाः । with ASK p 98 ब्रह्मकल्पैर्ब्रह्मभि ।

23 Cp DKC p 198 प्रहृताश्च पातकपथाः । with ASK p 12 प्रहृतेषु कापथेषु ।

APPENDIX III

PASSAGES SHOWING IDEAL AND VERBAL AFFINITY BETWEEN KA AND ASK

(Cp pt I, ch I, pp 15-6)

1 Cp KA II 258 राज्ञा हस्तारविन्दानि कुड्मलीकुरुते कुतः । देव, त्वच्चरणद्वन्द्वरविबालातपं स्पृशन् ॥ with ASK p 15 (विष्णु मूर्तेः पुरः) हस्तयुगम् प्रयत्नेनैव कुड्मलितम् । Also cp p 64 कुड्मलायमानकोमलाञ्जलि ।

2 Cp KA II 320 पद्मानामेव दण्डेषु कण्टकास्त्वयि रक्षति । यथवा दृश्यते रागिमिथुनालिङ्गनेष्वपि ॥ with ASK p 18 कण्टका कमलनालेष्वेव दृष्टाः, धानिष्ठलु पुनरपि दृष्टः प्रियतमानाम् आलिङ्गनेषु ।

3 Cp KA II 339 कृष्णार्जुनानुरक्तापि दृष्टि with ASK p 35 रक्तनीलधवलकान्तिना प्रियतमगणाधप्रभासवयेन ।

4 Cp KA III 184 एकस्त्वमप्यनेकोऽसि नमस्ते विश्वमूर्त्तये। with ASK p 1 भीनप्यसत्यनानात्वान् वन्दे विश्वशरीरिण।

5 Cp KA III 181 राज्ञा विनाशपिशुनश्चचार खरमारुत। with ASK p 52 अनन्तर च सवक्षत्र(प्रधन*)पिशुना महोत्पाता।

APPENDIX IV

PASSAGE SHOWING AFFINITY BETWEEN ASK AND ASKS

(Cp pt I, ch I, p 31, fn 1)

1 Cp ASK p 10 भूपतिर्जातकुतूहल अनेकश्रीमुखपरपरानुद्दृष्टम् एनम् आत्मसादकरोत्। with ASKS I 27 इति श्रुत्वा महीपालस्तदालोकनलोलुप। अनेकश्रीमुखाद्दृष्टमकरोदमुमात्मसात्॥

2 Cp ASK p 13 आर्य, सभाव्य एवास्य शिल्पिवरस्य प्रणय। with ASKS I 45 आर्य सभाव्यतामस्य स्थपते प्रणयस्त्वया।

3 Cp ASK p 26 दैत्यराजमिव शुचिशुक्रमयम् उग्रातपम् अनुबुभूषु सरासयवजगाहे। with ASKS II 13 दैत्यराजमिवादीप्तशुचिशुक्रविरोचनम्। निदाघमनुभूयासौ जगाहे सरसीजलम्॥

4 Cp ASK p 38 विदितमेव देवस्य यथाऽहमेवलिङ्गी मालवेषु प्रति वसामि। तत्र च मालवेश्वर with ASKS II 33 विदित नाम देवस्य यथाऽह भवदाज्ञया। एवलिङ्गी वसाम्येष मालवेषु तदीश्वर॥

5 Cp ASK p 127 नातिस्थूण(स्फुट)या वर्णश्रेण्या मा साहसम् इत्यवोचत्। with ASKS II 102 उपवीक्ष्यास्फुटा वाच मा साहसमिति व्यधात्॥

6 Cp ASK p 158 कदाचिदपरयामे स्वप्ने सप्तसागरपरिधिम तम् पुण्यलग्नणा देवी जगद्गोल जग्रसे। with ASKS III 56 यामिन्यापश्चिमे यामे स्वप्ने देवी कदाचन। बहुद्वीपार्णवाकीर्णं जगद्गोल तु जग्रसे॥

7 Cp ASK p 172 तत्राय अनकराज अङ्गेश्वरेण साकम् एकरथेनैव मृत इवाकल्पम् अधिगायानस्तेन राजा मागधेनापोह्यत। with ASKS III 81 अङ्गान्जरमध्यस्थो राजा चम्पेश्वरेण च। साकमेकरथेनासौ मागधेनापवाहित॥

8 Cp ASK p 172 आत्मना च स देव स एव निर्व्याजपौरुषो जितवान् अहं तु पराजित एव इति सवक्षत्रमध्ये शस्त्रं परित्यक्तवान् । with ASKS III 83 मालवेन्द्र पुरो राज्ञा स एवाव्याजपौरुष । जितवान् नाहमित्युक्त्वा तत्याज निजमायुधम् ॥

9 Cp ASK p 173 मम तु मन्दभाग्याया माता (?) कनीयासमप्यग्रहीत् । with ASKS III 87 माता मे मन्दभाग्याया करे निक्षिप्य बालकम् । मार्गे स्वयं कनीयांस भर्तृदारकमग्रहीत् ॥

10 Cp ASK p 180 भर्तृबाल्लभ्यम् अस्यामेवम् अनुपश्यतो मुने स्मितम जनिष्ट । with ASKS IV 33 दृष्ट्वैतद् भर्तृबाल्लभ्य तत्सव स्मरतो मुने । अजनि स्मितम् ।

11 Cp ASK p 181 आदिष्ट च स्वामिना श्रुतधरमादायोपवर्षं भजस्वेति । सो ऽयमेकसधरश्चिरेणाद्य दृष्ट । with ASKS IV 36 आदिष्टश्च कुमारेण लब्ध्वा श्रुतधरं तत । उपवर्ष भजस्वेति सोऽयमासादिताऽधुना ॥

12 Cp ASK p 181 सोऽप्याचचक्षे—काम्पिल्यनाम्नि नगरे गुरोर्गोपालकस्येन्द्रदत्तो नामाहम् आस शिष्य । तस्य विरूपेति विपरीतनामधेया कन्या । with ASKS IV 37 8 इत्युक्ते सोऽभ्यधत्तान्य इन्द्रदत्तोऽस्मि नामत । गुरोर्गोपालकस्याहं शिष्य काम्पिल्यदेशज ॥ विरूपेति विरुद्धाख्या कन्यासीत्तस्य ।

13 Cp ASK p 182 कदाचिदसौ ज्येष्ठभार्ययाऽन्यजन्मन्यपि मा भूव मूर्खजायेति मूर्खस्य कस्यचित् कशिपुदानपारणीये मूलव्रते with ASKS IV 49 मा भूव मूर्खजायेति ज्येष्ठभार्या कदाचन । मूर्खस्य कशिपु दत्वा धा(पा)र्यं व्रतमधारयत् ॥

14 Cp ASK p 182 तष्टा टङ्केन रसनाम उदस्तस्तुतावास्ये स्वास्येन किमपि देव प्रक्षिप्तवान् । with ASKS IV 52 तष्टा टङ्केन तज्जिह्वा किमपि निक्षिप्तवान् मुने ।

15 Cp ASK p 182 क्रमात् प्रणु य दिवसम् एकेन कात्यायनो द्वाभ्या व्याडिस्त्रिभिरिन्द्रदत्त कृत्स्न वाङमयम् अध्यगीषत । with ASKS IV 64 इत्युक्तास्तेऽभिवन्द्यैनमध्यगीषत वाङ्मयम् । सकृत् कात्यायन श्रुत्वा द्विर्व्याडिस्त्रिरथापर ॥

16 Cp ASK p 186 अयमहं रामतीर्थान्निवर्तमानो वर्तयाम मनुकलिङ्गतुङ्गदारुणि महत्यरण्य नकरायनन निवस (?) with ASKS IV 72 अहमद्य कलिङ्गेषु तुङ्गदारुणि कानने । रामतीर्थान्निवृत्त सन् प्राप्तोऽस्मि हरमन्दिरम् ॥

17 Cp ASK pp 199 200 प्रतिज्ञात चामुया जातस्य जामिपुत्रस्योत्माद नम् । इद च पश्यतो मम जुगुप्सैवाम्या स्त्रीजातौ जाता । with ASKS IV 128 प्रतिज्ञात तया भूयो जामिपुत्रविनाशनम । तत्पश्यतो जुगुप्सा मे स्त्रीजातेऽपि महत्यभूत् ॥

18 Cp ASK p 201 स चैकपरमेश्वरो ब्रह्मराक्षसनियुद्धेनोपरम्य कामपाल इति धमपालनाम्नो मागधामात्याद् उत्पद्य with ASKS IV 202 ब्रह्मरक्षोनियुद्धेन मृत्वैकपरमेश्वर । धमपालस्य नामासीत् कामपालास्यया सुत ॥

19 Cp ASK p 217 वैष्णवाना हि तेजसामुदित इव कश्चिदशस्त्वदात्मना स्थित । सव एवात परिभवद्नु (भवस्तु) द्विमासमात्र सोऽय(त्य) with ASKS V 30 स्थित सर्वहितायोर्व्यां विष्णोरशस्त्वदात्मना । मासद्वयावधिनून भावी परिभवश्च ते ॥

20 Cp ASK p 222 तेषा दक्षिणत कोऽपि ब्रह्मचारी ब्राह्मणकुमार शरद्भिभूतया समावर्ज्यमानदृष्टिरिद वसन्ततिलकम उच्चैरुज्जहार । with ASKS V 37 तेषा दक्षिणत कोऽपि ब्रह्मचारी द्विजोत्तम । शरत्समृद्धि सबद्ध वसन्ततिलक जगौ ॥

21 Cp ASK p 226 एकस्मिश्च सिकतिले वनस्पतिमूले प्राङ्मुखमासीनम ब्रणकिणकर्कशकायम् चीरवासस ददश । with ASKS V 42 तत्रैकस्मिन् समासीन तरुमूलतले द्विजम् । व्रणककशकाय ते ददृशु श्चीरवाससम् ।

APPENDIX V

PARALLEL PASSAGES FROM DKC AND ASKS
(Cp pt I, ch I pp 31 2)

1 Cp DKC p 61 भवतिनश्च ममाद्य शाप । प्रमीऽदानीम, किं तव करणीयम् ? —इति प्रणिपतन्ती वात्यानया मत्पाणमया समाश्वासयेति क्याख्य विससज । with ASKS VII 92 मुक्तोऽच शाप करवाणि कि त प्रमीऽ दवेति नता नताङ्गी । मद्वात्याप्रश्वासय वायु वात्यामितीरिता तेन दिव जगाम ॥

2 Cp DKC pp 64 5 ऽस्त्यमुमरीचिर्नाम महर्षि । ममुतो

बुभुक्षुस्त्वद्गतिम with ASKS VIII 5 जिनामुस्त्वद्गतिं तस्माद् दिव्यज्ञानजुषो मुने ।

3 Cp DKC p 65 आसीत्तादृशो मुनिरस्मिन्नाश्रमे । तमेकदा काममञ्जरी नाम वारयुवतिरभ्यवर्तिष्ट । तस्मिन्नेव च क्षणे मातृप्रमुखस्तदाप्तवर्ग आपतत् । with ASKS VIII 7 तादृशो मुनिरासीत्त गणिका काममञ्जरी । ववन्दे जातु जातार्तिर्माता च पुनरापतत् ॥

4 Cp DKC pp 66-8 अस्य मे दोषमेषा वो दासी विज्ञापयति । दोषश्च मम स्वाधिकारानुष्ठापनम् । एष हि गणिकामातुरधिकारो यद् दुहितुर्जन्मप्रभृत्यङ्गक्रिया तेजोबलवर्णमेधासंवर्धनेन दोषाग्निधातुसाम्यकृता मितेनाहारेण शरीरपोषणम् आपञ्चमाद्वर्षात् पितुरप्यनतिदर्शनम्, जन्मदिने पुण्यदिने चोत्सवोत्तरो मङ्गलविधि, अध्यापनमनङ्गविद्यानां साङ्गानाम् नृत्यगीतवाद्यनाट्यचित्रास्वाद्यगन्धपुष्पकलासु लिपिज्ञानवचनकौशलादिषु च सम्यग् विनयनम्, शब्दहेतुसमयविद्यासु वार्तामात्रावबोधनम्, आजीवज्ञाने क्रीडाकौशले सजीवनिर्जीवासु च द्यूतकलास्वभ्यन्तरीकरणम्, अभ्यन्तरकलासु वैश्वासिकजनाद् प्रयत्नेन प्रयोगग्रहणम्, यात्रोत्सवादिष्वादरप्रसाधिताया स्फीतपरिबर्हाया प्रकाशनम्, प्रसङ्गवत्यां सङ्गीतादिक्रियाया पूर्वसंगृहीतैर्ग्राह्यवाग्भि सिद्धिलम्भनम् दिङ्मुखेषु तत्तच्छिल्पवित्तकैर्यश प्रख्यापनम्, पीठमर्दविटविदूषकैर्भिक्षुक्यादिभिश्च नागरिकपुरुषसमवायेषु रूपशीलशिल्पसौन्दर्यमाधुर्यप्रस्तावना युवजनमनोरथलक्ष्यभूताया प्रभूततमेन शुल्केनाव स्थापनम्, स्वतो रागान्धाय तद्भावदर्शनोन्मादिताय वा जातिरूपवयोऽर्थशक्तिशौचत्यागदाक्षिण्यशिल्पशीलमाधुर्योपपन्नाय स्वतन्त्राय प्रदानम् अधिकगुणायास्वतन्त्राय प्राज्ञतमायाल्पेनापि बहूकृत्य स्वेनार्पणम् अस्वतन्त्रेण वा गान्धर्वसमागमेन तद्गुरुभ्य शुल्कापहरणम्, अलाभेऽर्थस्य कामस्वीकृते स्वामिन्यधिकरणे च साधनम् रक्तस्य दुहितैकचारिणीव्रतानुष्ठापनम् नित्यनैमित्तिकप्रीतिदायकतया हृतशिष्टानां गम्यधनानां चित्रैरुपायैरपहरणम् अर्थशून्यप्रायेण च विगृह्यासनम्, प्रतिहस्तिप्रोत्साहनेन लुब्धस्य रागिणस्त्यागशक्तिसंधुक्षणम् असारस्य वाक्यतक्षणैर्लोकापवादैर्दुहितृनिरोधनैर्व्रीडोत्पादनैरभियोगरवमानैश्चापवाहनम् अर्थदत्तयप्रतिघातिभिरर्थानर्थसंशयैरनुबद्धापायान् अयमन्यानपि विचार्य भूयोभूय संयोजनमिति । with ASKS VIII 9 18 एषा मे दापमाचष्टे स्वाधिकाराननुष्ठानम् । एष मात्राधिकारो ना दुहितु साधु वर्धनम् ॥ अङ्गक्रिया मिताहारैं पोषणा धातुवर्धनैं । जन्मवत्सरपुण्याहेषु ना नन्दनम् ॥ शिक्षा चानङ्गविद्यानां नृत्यशास्त्रावबोधनम् । वार्ताविबोधनं शास्त्रेष्वाजीव

शानलम्भनम् ॥ क्रीडा सजीवनिर्जीवद्यूतादिष्ववतारणम् । अभ्यासन जनादाक्षादस्यन्तरकलासु च ॥ यात्रोत्सवादिषु स्फीतमण्डनाया प्रकाशनम् । सगीतादिषु तद्वित्तैर्नैपुण्यस्यापन जनै ॥ पीठमर्दविटप्रायै शीलमाधुर्यवर्णना । अनल्पन च शुल्केन स्थापन यौवन (स्थित ॥ विशिष्ट)गुणयुक्ताय स्वतन्त्राय समर्पणम् । गुणाढ्यायाल्पशुल्केऽपि दान बहुपदर्शत ॥ अस्वतन्त्राय वा दत्वा गुरुभ्य शुल्कसग्रह । (गान्धर्वेण धनालाभे स्वीकृत्य स्वा)मिन धनै ॥ नीत्वा गम्यधनादान दु(लु)ब्धश्रावण विग्रह । लुब्धस्य रागिण-स्त्यागोत्थापन प्रतिहस्तिना ॥ प्रसारस्यावमानैर्वात्तजनै(रपवाहनम् । अपदैरनिनि)र्मूय सयोजनमिति स्थिति ॥

5 Cp DKC p 68 गणिकायाश्च गम्य प्रति सज्जनैव, न सग । सत्या मपि प्रीतौ न मातुर्मातृकाया वा शासनातिवृत्ति । with ASKS VIII 19 गणिकायाश्च युक्ता नो गम्य प्रत्यनुरागिता । सत्यामपि क्वचित् प्रीतौ मातृवाक्यानतिक्रम ॥

6 Cp DKC p 68 स्वनैव धनव्ययन रममाणया स्वकुटुम्ब चावसादि तम् । with ASKS VIII 20 रमन स्वव्ययेनैषा कुटुम्ब चावसादिनम् ।

7 Cp DKC p 69 सा अलघुभक्ति दवताचनकुसुमाच्चयावचय-प्रयासै त्रिवगसवर्धिनीभि कथाभि अल्पीयसैव कालेना वरञ्जयत् । with ASKS VIII 24 नवया परिचरन्त्यनमचनाकुसुमाच्चयै । त्रिवगवद्धया वाचा न चिरात्प्राऽवरञ्जयत् ॥

8 Cp DKC pp 69-70 मूढ खलु नाको य सह धर्मेणार्थकामावपि गणयति । (धम) नार्थकामाभ्या बाध्यते । तथा हि पितामहस्य तिलो-त्तमाभिलाष , नानवनाम्न धमपीडामावहति । with ASKS VIII 25-6 धममवोत्तम मन्ये यत्ताभ्या नैव बाध्यत । तथा पितामहादीना श्रूयता सन्त्रनिष्क्रमा ॥ न धमपीडा कुवन्ति श्रेयान् धमस्ततो मत ।

9 Cp DKC pp 70-1 किं तु जन्मन प्रभृत्यथकामवार्तानभिज्ञा वयम् । अथस्यावदर्जनवधनरक्षणात्मक । कृषिपाशुपाल्यवाणिज्य-सधिविग्रहादिपरिवार , तीर्थप्रतिपादनफलश्च । कामस्तु स्त्रीपुसयोर्नि-रतिशयसुखस्पर्शविशेष । with ASKS VIII 27-8 अथकामानभि-ज्ञोऽहं कीदृशाविति, साऽब्रवीत् । कृष्यादिपाशुपाल्यसाध्यस्त्वर्थो जनाम्नक ॥ अनुत्तरसुखस्पर्श काम स्त्रीपुसयोरिति ।

10 Cp DKC p 72 स्वाथ इदानीमनुष्ठय । with ASKS VIII 31 स्वाथ कतव्य ।

11 Cp DKC p 72 सिद्धार्था चास्मि स्वस्थानाद् । with ASKS VIII

32 कृतार्था त्वत्प्रसादत ।

12. Cp DKC p 73 अचिरादेव नवय आत्मा त्वदर्थसाधनक्षम कर्तुम् । अस्यामेव तावद् वसाङ्गपुर्यां चम्पायाम् । with ASKS VIII 33-4 सोऽहमस्मि क्षणेन स्या त्वदर्थापादनक्षम ॥ अस्या वसाङ्गपुर्यां ।

13. Cp DKC p 73 विहारस्य बहि निषण्ण माधिक्षीणम् अग्रगण्य मनभिरूपाणा क्षपणकम् (अदनाम्) with ASKS VIII 35 बहिर्विहारमासीनमाधिक्षीणमरूपिणम् । ऐक्षे क्षपणकम् ।

14. Cp DKC p 74 तस्य च मम च वपुर्वसुनी निमित्तीकृत्य वैरम् पौरधूर्तैरुदपाद्यत । त एव प्रकृष्टगणिकाप्राप्ययौवनो हि य स पुमान् इति व्यवास्थापयन् । with ASKS VIII 37 तयोर्नौ वसुरूपोत्थ स्पर्धयो पौरधा अका । प्रकृष्टगणिकाप्राप्य श्लाघनामित्यकल्पयन् ॥

15. Cp DKC pp 76-7 अहम च किंचित्प्रमादत्तनार क्वचित् कितव । अनिश्चितवस्तु किं ायसि रे द्यूनवत्म हासव्याजेन ? त्वमव तावद् विचक्षणेन देक्ष्यामीनि व्यत्यपजत् । मया जितश्चासो । तदर्थं सभिकाय दत्त्वोदतिष्ठम् । with ASKS VIII 42 3 क्वचित् प्रमादविन्यस्तनारके हसित मया । किं त्व शिक्षयसि द्यूत दक्ष्यामि त्वयेति माम् ॥ अभिघायतर क्रोधाद व्यतिपज्य जितो मया । सभिकाय समर्प्याहि जितद्रव्यार्धमुत्थित ॥

16. Cp DKC p 77 यन्मूलश्च म दुरोदरावतार स मे विमर्दको नाम विश्वास्यतर द्वितीय हृदयमासीत् । with ASKS VIII 44 विमर्दक सुहृन्मऽभूद यन्मूल द्यूतमापतत् ।

17. Cp DKC p 78 तदमङ्गलमद्य किल प्रभात भावीति ज्ञात्वा प्रागेव तदगारम् अभिसरामि । with ASKS VIII 49 तदमङ्गलमप्राप्य श्वो भावीति निशि स्वयम । यामि प्रियतमागारम् ॥

18. Cp DKC p 80 नाथित्वमिव किंचित् प्रवासरवयो देशत्यागन सभाव्यते । तत्सहानया सुखमिहैव वस्तव्यम । with ASKS VIII 53 स्वामिन्नथ्यमिहैव स्यात् प्रवासापिन्यमन्यथा ।

19. Cp DKC p 82 मन्यत्र चेय वणिग्भ्यो वारमुख्याभ्यो वा दुग्ध इति तद्गता मतीति । with ASKS VIII 61 वणिग्भ्यो गणिकाभ्या वा दुग्धे चेय मदयन । ईदृग कल्प ॥

20. Cp DKC p 93 पलिता मव मुलाति । with ASKS VIII 84 पलितरत्वनाय ।

21. Cp DKC p 95 म दुर्मति गुरुरमुन्मादन । with ASKS VIII

89 स दूरमुदमायत ।

22 Cp DKC p 98 शरदम्भोधरोत्सङ्गगामिनीमिव सौदामिनीं राजकन्यामनन्यम् । दृष्ट्वैव चोरयितव्यमिति स्पृहयन्त्येव तावत्त्वामाराध्य with ASKS VIII 94 शरदम्बुधरोत्सङ्गगाम्यामिव गगनश्रिया । तस्करस्यापि मे चेतस्तयैव मुषितं तदा ॥

23 Cp DKC p 99 त्वामयमावद्धाञ्जलिः दासजनस्तमिममयमयपत । स्वमिहि मया सह सुरतव्यतिकरस्विन्नैव मा मैवम् ॥ with ASKS VIII 98 *id* except °स्विन्नैवमेव त्वम् ॥

24 Cp DKC p 104 पुत्रवृत्तान्तेन श्रोत्रमस्य देव्या प्रियवदामाजुहाव । with ASKS VIII 117 प्रजुहाव महादेव्या श्रोत्रे पुत्रवार्तया ।

25 Cp DKC p 106 कन्दसुन्दरी कलासु रूप चाप्सरसामप्यतिक्रान्ता पतिमभिभूय वर्तते । with ASKS VIII 123 रूपगीतवधोरम्या कलासु कृतकौशला । भर्तारमभिभूयास्ते ॥

APPENDIX VI

'प्रयोगानुपलक्ष्य च'—KA I 2 (ILLUSTRATIONS OF KA WHICH ARE REMINISCENT OF THE VERSES OF EARLIER WRITERS)

(Cp pt I ch I, p 11, fn 3 ch II p 37, fn 3 ch III p 62, fn 4)

1 Cp KA I 45 इन्दोरिन्दीवरद्युति । लक्ष्म लक्ष्मीं तनोतीति with Śāk I 20 मलिनमपि हिमांशोर्लक्ष्म लक्ष्मीं तनोति ।

2 Cp KA II 129 प्रभामात्रं हि तरलं दृश्यते न तदाश्रयः । with Śāk I 28 न प्रभातरलं ज्योतिरुदेति वसुधातलात् ।

3 Cp KA II 197 परस्ताल्लाक्षमहायमकस्य सूर्यरश्मिभिः । दृष्टिरापकरभूता यौवनज्वरेण तम ॥ with Kād para 103 केवलं च निसर्गत एवाभानुभेद्यम् अरत्नालोकोच्छेद्यम् अप्रदीपप्रभापनेयम् अतिगहनं तमो यौवनप्रभवम् ।

4 Cp KA II 203 वक्त्रं नितम्बमुरसि वपुरम्लानमुदरम । with Śāk I 18 इदं किलाव्याजमनोहरं वपु ।

5 Cp KA II 226,362 लिम्पतीव तमोऽङ्गानि वर्षतीवाञ्जन नभ । असत्पुरुषसेवेव दृष्टिर्विफलता गता ॥ with Bālac I 15 Cāru I 19, Mṛcch I. 34 etc

6 Cp KA II 280 मृतेति प्रेत्य सगन्तु यया मे मरण मतम् । सैवावन्ती मया लब्धा कथमत्रैव जन्मनि ॥ which seems to have originally occurred in Svap

7 Cp KA II 286 यस्या कुसुमशय्यापि कोमलाङ्ग्या रुजाकरी । साऽधिशेते कथ तन्वी हुताशनवती चिताम् ॥ with Ragh VIII 57 नवपल्लवसस्तरेऽपि ते मृदु दूयेत यदङ्गमर्पितम । तदिद विषहिष्यते कथ वद वामोरु चिताधिरोहणम् ॥

8 Cp KA II 302 रत्नभित्तिषु सक्रान्तै प्रतिबिम्बशतैर्वृत । ज्ञातो लङ्केश्वर कृच्छ्रादाञ्जनेयेन तत्त्वत ॥ with Kād para 85 अमल-मणिभूमिसक्रान्तमुखनिवहप्रतिबिम्बतया विकचकमलपुष्पप्रकरमिव सपाद यता वारविलासिनीजनेन । (Also cp with Śiś II 4 रत्न-स्तम्भेषु सक्रान्तप्रतिमास्ते चकाशिरे । एकाकिनोऽपि परित पौरुषेयवृता इव ॥)

9 Cp KA III 95 नून नुन्नानि मानेन नाननेनाननानि न । नानेना ननु नानूननेनानानिनो निनो ॥ with Kir XV 14 न नोननुन्नो नुन्नोनो नाना नानानना ननु । नुन्नोऽनुन्नो ननुन्नेनो नानेना नुन्ननुन्ननुत् ॥

APPENDIX VII

PARALLEL PASSAGES FROM DANDIN'S KA AND BHĀMAHA S KAl

(Cp pt I, ch III p 65, fn 1)

1 Cp KA I 7 तदल्पमपि नोपेक्ष्य काव्ये दुष्ट कथचन । स्याद्वपु सुन्दरमपि श्वित्रेणैकेन दुर्भगम् ॥ with KAl I 6 सर्वथा पदमप्येक न निगाद्यमवद्य वत् । and I 11 सर्वथा पदमप्येक न निगाद्यमवद्यवत् । विलक्ष्मणा हि काव्येन दुस्सुतेनेव निन्द्यते ॥

2 Cp KA I 14 सर्गबन्धो महाकाव्यमुच्यते तस्य लक्षणम् । with KAl I 19 सर्गबन्धो महाकाव्य महता च महच्च यत् ।

3 Cp KA I 15 इतिहासकथोद्भूतमितरद्वा सदाश्रयम् । चतुर्वर्गफलायत्तं चतुरोदात्तनायकम् ॥ with KAl I. 19, 21 सदाश्रयम् ॥ चतुर्वर्गाभिधानेऽपि भूयसार्थोपदेशकृत् ।

4 Cp KA. I. 17-9 मन्त्रदूतप्रयाणाजिनायकाभ्युदयैरपि । अलङ्कृतमसंक्षिप्तं रसभावनिरन्तरम् ॥ सर्गैरनतिविस्तीर्णैः श्रव्यवृत्तैः सुसन्धिभिः । सर्वत्र भिन्नवृत्तान्तैरुपेतं लोकरञ्जकम् ॥ काव्यं कल्पान्तरस्थायि जायते सदलङ्कृति । with KAl I 19-20 अग्राम्यशब्दमर्थ्यं च सालङ्कारं सदाश्रयम् ॥ मन्त्रदूत प्रयाणाजिनायकाभ्युदयैश्च यत् । पञ्चभिः सन्धिभिर्युक्तं नातिव्याख्येयमृद्धिमत् ॥

5 Cp KA I 21-2 गुणतः प्रागुपन्यस्य नायकं तेन विद्विषाम् । निराकरणमित्येष मार्गः प्रकृतिसुन्दरः ॥ वंशवीर्यश्रुतादीनि वर्णयित्वा रिपोरपि । तज्जयान्नायकोत्कर्षवर्णनं च धिनोति नः ॥ with KAl I 22 3 नायकं प्रागुपन्यस्य वंशवीर्यश्रुतादिभिः । न तस्यैव वधं ब्रूयादन्योत्कर्षाभिधित्सया ॥ यदि काव्यशरीरस्य न स व्यापितयेष्यते । न चाभ्युदयभाक्तस्य मुधादौ ग्रहणं स्तवे ॥

6 Cp KA I. 23-4 तयोराख्यायिका किल ॥ नायकेनैव वाच्याऽन्या नायकेनेतरेण वा । स्वगुणाविष्क्रिया दोषो नात्र भूतार्थशंसिनः ॥ with KAl I 29 अन्यैः स्वचरितं तस्यां नायकेन तु नोच्यते । स्वगुणाविष्कृतिं कुर्यादभिजातः कथं जनः ॥

7 Cp KA I 29-30 कन्याहरणसङ्ग्रामविप्रलम्भोदयादयः । सर्गबन्धसमा एव नैते वैशेषिका गुणाः ॥ कविभावकृतं चिह्नमन्यत्रापि न दुष्यति । with KAl I. 27 कवेरभिप्रायकृतैः कथनैः कैश्चिदङ्किता । कन्याहरणसङ्ग्रामविप्रलम्भोदयान्विता ॥

8 Cp KA I 40 तत्र वैदर्भगौडीयौ वर्ण्येते प्रस्फुटान्तरौ ॥ with KAl I 32 गौडीयमिदमेतत्तु वैदर्भमिति किं पृथक् ।

9 Cp KA I 43-4 शिथिलं मालतीमाला लोलालिकलिला यथा ॥ अनुप्रासधिया गौडैस्तदिष्टं बन्धगौरवात् । with KAl II. 6 ग्राम्यानुप्रासमन्यत्तु मन्यन्ते सुधियोऽपरे । स लोलमालानीलालिकुलाकुलगला बलः ॥

10 Cp KA I 66-7 पदसन्धानवृत्त्या वा वाक्यार्थत्वेन वा पुनः । दुष्प्रतीतिकरं ग्राम्यं यथा या भवतः प्रिया ॥ खरं प्रहृत्य विश्रान्तः पुरुषो वीर्यवानिति । with KAl I 51-2 हेतुमच्च प्रवृत्तस्य सन्धेस्य विवर्जितम् । दृश्यते जायतेऽस्याश्च कृच्छ्रेण पुनरानतिः ॥ पदद्वयस्य सन्धाने दुष्टमिष्टं प्रवर्तते । तदाहुः कल्पनादुष्टं स शौर्यभरणो यथा ॥

11 Cp KA I 80 ओज समासभूयस्त्वमेतद् गद्यस्य जीवितम् । with KAl II 2 केचिदोजोऽभिधित्सन्त समस्यन्ति बहूनपि ।

12 Cp KA II 5 6 प्रेयो रसवदूर्जस्वि पर्यायोक्त समाहितम् । उदात्तापह्नुति श्लेषविशेषास्तुल्ययोगिता ॥ विरोधाप्रस्तुतस्तोत्र व्याजस्तुतिनिदर्शने । with KAl III 1 2 प्रेयो रसवदूर्जस्वि पर्यायोक्त समाहितम् । द्विप्रकारमुदात्त च भेद श्लिष्टमपि त्रिभि ॥ अपह्नुति विशेषोक्ति विरोध तुल्ययोगिताम् । अप्रस्तुतप्रशसा च व्याजस्तुतिनिदर्शने ॥

13 Cp KA II 200 (the example of *Vibhāvanā*) अपीतक्षीव कादम्बमसमृष्टामलाम्बरम् । अप्रसादितशुद्धाम्बु जगदासीन्मनोहरम् ॥ with KAl II 78 अपीतमत्ता शिखिनो दिशोऽनुत्कण्ठिताकुला । नीपो ऽविलितसुरभिरभ्रष्ट कलुष जलम् ॥

14 Cp KA II 235 हेतुश्च सूक्ष्मलेशौ च वाचामुत्तमभूषणम् । with KAl II 86 हेतुश्च सूक्ष्मो लेशोऽथ नालकारतया मत ।

15 Cp KA II 244 गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिण । इतीदमपि साध्वेव कालावस्थानिवेदने ॥ with KAl II 87 गतोऽस्तमर्को भातीन्दुर्यान्ति वासाय पक्षिण । इत्येवमादि किं काव्य वार्त्तामेना प्रचक्षते ॥

16 Cp KA II 276 7 अद्य या मम गोविन्द जाता त्वयि गृहागते । काले नैषा भवेत्प्रीतिस्तवैवागमनात् पुन ॥ इत्याह युक्त विदुरो नान्यतस्तादृशी धृति । with KAl III 5 6 प्रेयो गृहागत कृष्णमवादीद्विदुरो यथा ॥ अद्य या मम etc *(id)*

17 Cp KA II 300,302 उदात्त नाम त प्राहुरलकार मनीषिण । रत्नभित्तिषु सक्रान्त प्रतिबिम्बशतैर्वृत । with KAl III 12 नाना रत्नाद्युक्त यत्तत्किलोदात्तमुच्यते ॥

18 Cp KA II 324 (ex of *visesokti*) न कठोर न वा तीक्ष्णमायुध पुष्पधन्वन । तथापि जितमेवासीदमुना भुवनत्रयम् ॥ with KAl III 24 स एकस्त्रीणि जयति जगन्ति कुसुमायुध । हरतापि तनु यस्य शम्भुना न बल हृतम् ॥

19 Cp KA II 331 (ex of *tulyayogitā*) यम कुबेरो वरुण सहस्राक्षो भवानपि । बिभ्रत्यनन्यविषया लोकपाल इति श्रुतिम् ॥ with KAl III 28 शेषो हिमगिरिस्त्व च महान्तो गुरव स्थिरा । यदलङ्घितमर्यादाश्चलन्तीं बिभृथ क्षितिम् ॥

20 Cp KA III 120 विजितात्मभवद्वेषिगुरुपादहतो जन । हिमापहा

मित्रघ्नैर्व्याप्त व्योमानिनन्दति ॥ with KAl I 41 *id* except व्योमैत्यवाचकम् ॥

21 Cp KA III 125-7 अपार्थं व्यर्थमेकार्थं ससंशयमपक्रमम्। शब्दहीनं यतिभ्रष्टं भिन्नवृत्तं विसन्धिकम् ॥ देशकालकलालोकन्यायागमविरोधि च। इति दोषा दशैवैते वर्ज्याः काव्येषु सूरिभिः ॥ प्रतिज्ञाहेतुदृष्टान्तहानिर्दोषो न वेत्यसौ। विचारः कर्कशः प्रायस्तेनालीढेन किं फलम् ॥ with KAl IV 1-2 (first three lines *id*) प्रतिज्ञाहेतुदृष्टान्तहीनं दुष्टं च नेष्यते ॥

22 Cp KA III 128 समुदायार्थशून्यं यत्तदपार्थमितीष्यते। with KAl IV 8 समुदायार्थशून्यं यत्तदपार्थकमिष्यते।

23 Cp KA III 136 उत्कामुन्मनयन्त्येते बाला तदलकत्विषः। अम्भोधरास्तडित्वन्तो गम्भीराः स्तनयित्नवः ॥ with KAl IV 16 तामु-त्कमनसं नूनं करोति ध्वनिरम्भसाम्। मौघेषु घनमुक्तानां धाराणीमुन्पातिनाम् ॥

APPENDIX VIII

SOME MISSING VERSES IN THE TEXT OF KA

(Cp pt I ch II p 39 fn 1)

1 उत्तिष्ठेय। क्वचिदागमेनलक्ष्यस्य साक्षात्क्रमेण कौतनात्।—cited by Jagaddhara on Malat I 1

2 पदार्थे वाक्यवचनं वाक्यार्थे च पदाभिधा। प्रौढिरुक्तिसमासौ च साभिप्राय-त्वमस्य च ॥—cited by the same commentator on Mālat I 10

3 गम्भीर कुट्टिनी दासी धमन्यास्त्रवहिष्कृता। विटचेटपादया नित्य बाधा प्रकरणे मता।—cited by him on *ib* I 18 f

4 दशगर्भा प्राग् यो द्वाक् दमामम्बन्त स्यामुच्चितेर। दवमुद्गिदपृत्वि कन्तुला पुष्पागोऽस्मात् मतान् कनु ॥—cited in *Jayamangalā* on Kām I 3 16 (under the art *durvā alayoga*)

5 दोग्दन द्विरदपुर रनस्य विग्नोवनाय प्रतिविम्बितस्य पानराष्ट्रे। स्थानि त्रिस्थानि भूमिमनि रोषाग्नवाम जनयति राजसुन्दरमय ॥—cited in the same comm on *Kāryasamasyāpurana* in Kām, the last line being the *samasyā*

6 व्याधिव्याधिपरीताय अद्य श्वो वा विनाशिने । को हि नाम शरीराय धर्मापेतं समाचरेत् ॥—found after III 160 in the Calcutta ed of Premacandra Tarkavāgīśa (1863) and in the BORI ed of Pt Reddi (Poona, 1938)

APPENDIX IX

DAṆḌIN'S FELICITY OF DICTION (दण्डिनः पदलालित्यम्) WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO HIS USE OF ALLITERATION (*ANUPRĀSA*) AND *YAMAKA*

(Cp pt III, ch II p 380, fns 1 3 p 385, fn 3)

ANUPRĀSA

1 अथ विदितवार्त्तावार्तो महादवीमालवेन्द्रो (DKC p 57)
2 रुरोध च धनभरदत्तकम्परचम्पाम् (ib p 58)
3 साधयेय साध्य सम्यक् (ib p 120)
4 गतुमनम क्षमातल विगलयेत्परवस्य नम्या शिशायिषमाण शिरसि कुवलञ्जलिम् (ib p 137)
5 यावदपामरद् वामर, नवरी च सर्वा (ib p 155)
6 गमे सैषा सज्जनाचरिता सरणिरयरणीयमि कारणेऽलरणीमानादर सद्दमने (ib p 174)
7 निनि निनि निनिनाकराचिचि नीरन्ध्रान्धकारकणनिकरनिगीणदर्शादिशि निद्रानिगडितनिखिलजनदृशि (ib p 180)
8 मध्यमस्तु तया मनारथो मनोरथ इव चिरणोपपन्न धमस्य माहात्म्यवतो महितमनान्नोपपूरितान् मनीभूमानिनान् मर्यानारम्भणोचितान् महागुण रत्नराशिभाजो महामत्यान् महोदधीनिव मध्यमा लोकचतुर गुनानलभत (ASK p 11)
9 गम्भि दत्तास्थान समग्रगामन्तसनिधौ मधीरम् (ib p 73)
10 हृदयमुद्दयन्तुद्धरध्वनिधारावधीरितधाराधरध्वनिरम्ययत्त (ib p 74)
11 प्रजनासु न्वनैनावप्रीतासु प्रनीयमाना प्रलयाय पतु प्रलयपान पनङ्गा (ib p 103)
12 यद्दे निनिनिरवकाशागमनीतनिनिवानकरनपवननायिन शरीरिण (हिम यनानि वन्दयन्ति) (ib p 151)

13 रमितवर्षमुष्मिन् लवोऽपि लोभस्य, लवोऽपि लाघवस्य, कणिकाऽपि कार्पण्यस्य, क्षोदोऽपि क्षुद्रभावस्य, शकलमप्यकुशलस्य रजोऽपि राज्यदाहस्य प्रजाभिरनायत (ib p 154)
14 वृत्ते च विस्थानमविधानविहिते विधौ (ib p 156)
15 महदिदमाविर्भूतमद्भुत भूताना मुनिहन्तुरित्यविरतहृदयबाष्पपूरप्लुतनयना शपते सर्वे (ib p 161)

YAMAKA

1 देव, देवप्रसादादेव (DKC p 120)[1]
2 इति बहुश्रुते विश्रुते विकचराजीवसदृश दृशाम् (ib p 186)
3 भारवि रविमिवेन्दु (ASK p 10)
4 शान्तामंदया नमदया (ib p 139)
5 उपचक्रमे क्रमेण, विबुधो बुध नहुषनन्दनो नन्दन, बहुविधनयावधाना बहुविध, तपस्या कृतसवरण सवरण, तपनीयपत्रचित्रधन्वा सुधन्वा etc (ib pp 147 9)
6 सवर्वर्णिन्या वरवर्णिन्यामजायतासौ निधि (ib p 179)

APPENDIX X

IDIOMS AND PHRASES

(Cp pt III ch II p 384, fn 2)

1 मतिरिनाऽहमस्य हास्यो जात (DKC p 195 cp Hear pp 62, 81)
2 मनसा मान सुष्टु कारयित्वा (DKC p 150 also cp p 164 and ASK p 51)
3 मनिष्पद्यमानलग्नायविभागम् मातुरीश्वभ्रूवान्यपुरम् (DKC p 56)
4 मनवन्नेव हि नव विनिममवदत् (ib p 55)

---

1 A famous example of yamaka (...) occurs in the PP p 23 कुमारा माराभिरामा रामाद्यौरुषा रुषा भस्मीकृतारयो रयोपहसितसमीरणा रणाभियानेन यानेन ।

5 अयोग्यश्च पुमानवनात् च प्रवृत्त (ib p 110)
6 असारमतिगरीयसा क्रीणामि (ib p 80)
7 आय, त्वया प्रिया म दत्ता, वाक्पुनममापहृता (ib p 79)
8 आ विरामाच्च मे रहस्य नाश्राव्यम् (ib p 164)
9 इति साभिलापमाभाषिता मया वाङ्मय मधुवपम् अवपत् (ib p 126)
10 इत्थ चायमर्योन्यानुबन्धी (ib p 95 also cp p 191)
11 इय मे साधीयसी मधा (ib p 92)
12 एतत्प्रग्रहणाद्य चिर चरितार्था दीक्षा (ib p 179)
13 वस्तवार्यो यत्परस्य हृतोर्मामाज्ञानामि । न स्मरामि स्वल्पमपि तवापकार मत्कृतम् (ib p 86)
14 किमप्रतिममाधेय वस्तु यदनमेव लोचनजलायुत्पतति (ASK pp 123-4)
15 कि मया मन्दभागया मृतया घ्नया वा (ASK p 170)
16 कृतास्मो प्रीतिदाय (ib p 177)
17 कोऽय दर्पो यदन्यवासमध्यनाचक्षित गम्यते (ib p 70)
18 क्षतपु क्षारमेव इव (ib p 25)
19 जाग्रतोरव नौ विभाता मा विभावरी (ib p 240)
20 जीवित हि नाम चतुःपञ्चाप्यहानि, तत्रापि भागधायम् अल्पाल्प वय खण्डम् (DKC p 194)
21 जीविताशा बलवती (KA II 139)
22 त च कौपीनाय करिष्याव [DKC p 83, also cp pp 74 (मलमल्लकोष–), 80 (मृद्भाण्ड–) 87 (अरमन्तक–), 89 (पटच्चर–)]
23 तदत्र सह्यता नौण्यहानि (DKC p 180)
24 तमव च सत्रमीकृत्य मस्य परमवीतुपम् (DKC p 93 also cp p 196 अमुना चव मक्रमण)
25 तस्य चित्रवपवार्ताप्रपञ्चेन श्रवणोत्सवोऽस्माक विधेय (DKC p 59)
26 तिष्ठतु तावत्तम (DKC p 186)
27 तृणाय मत्वा पपतिम् (DKC p 83)
28 त्वमत्तामत्ता याऽनुमत्त इत्युमत्त मुन्मत्ती (DKC p 100)
29 दिष्ट्या वधस (DKC p 92 also cp दिष्ट्वृद्धि, ASK pp 8 25 172)
30 दृष्टानि श्रुतानि च बहूतराणि माल्याश्चर्याणि मसारविलसितानि (ASK p 123)

31 देव, दीयतामनुग्रहार्द्रं चित्तम् (DKC p 59, also cp p 63 दृष्टि-दानेनानुगृह्यतामयमनाथजनः and ASK p 90 इतो दृष्टिदानेनानुग्रहः क्रियताम्।)

32 न चेद्रहस्यमिच्छामि श्रोतुं शोकहेतुम् (DKC pp 73-4 also cp p 123)

33 न चेद्वा नागरिकैरप्यचारितकानि प्रत्याययामि, द्रक्ष्यसि पारमष्टादशानां कारणानाम् (DKC p 92)

34 न हि वः शक्यमस्मादृशामभ्यर्थनमकृत्वा स्थातुम् (ASK p 13)

35 न ह्यतिनिपुणोऽपि पुरुषो नियतिलिखितां लेखामतिक्रमितुमलम् (DKC p 89 also cp KA II 172 नियतिः केन लङ्घ्यते ?)

36 नायं कामो धर्मस्य गन्धमपि कला स्पृशति (DKC p 70 also cp ASK p 151)

37 नाहमात्मविनाशाय वेतालोत्थापनमाचरेयम् (DKC p 117)

38 नैव जानात्याभिजात्य प्रियादपलापयितुम् (ASK p 58)

39 पन्थानः सन्तु ते शिवाः (KA II 141)

40 पश्यामि नान्यत्परं करणीयमन्यतरम् (ASK p 43)

41 पुत्रकृतान्तेन श्रोत्रमस्य प्रदहाव (DKC p 104 also cp ASKS VIII 117)

42 पृच्छा तावद् भवतु (DKC p 156)

43 मर्मकर्मजागरमनीकाग्नेनेव चमत्कारहुंकारदाहज्वर (DKC p 86)

44 मरीचिमावर्जितनवनीतमिव स्नायसे (DKC p 72)

45 भद्र, प्रसन्नस्ते तर्क (ASK p 175 cp Vikr II 11 f)

46 विस्मितेव विदितवदितस्य यथा (ASK p 44)

47 शाखाग्राहिक्याश्वानराव (DKC p 81)

48 श्रवणपथमागता एव नूनमुद्भिन्नो विदग्ध (ASK p 171)

49 सकलानि दृश्यानि रसनाग्रे सन्निहितानि (DKC p 179 cp the English phrase *on the tip of the tongue*)

50 सर्वं नूपुरनुरमनन् (DKC p 135 also cp p 144)

51 सत्यमस्तु मुक्तबन्धम् (DKC p 150)

52 स स विमदको नाम विश्वाम्भरस्य द्वितीयं हृदयम् (ib p 77)

53 स एव स दत्तो मम्मनि स्तनमिव नवत् (ib p 130)

54 मा मज्जनिमवप्तनतामनैषीः (DKC p 116 also cp p 126 मज्जनिक्षिप्तनासाशिरस मूर्धा प्रदाम्य, also cp for the idea,

ASK pp 15, 64, 145, 242)

55 सा मया समापत्तिदृष्टा (DKC p 146 also cp p 158 cp Vikr I)

56 सार्थवाहस्यार्थपतेर्विमर्दको बहिश्चरा प्राणा (DKC p 86)

57 सयमाकृतिर्न व्यभिचरति शीलम् (DKC p 161 also cp रूपानुरूप शील–, pp 85, 108, Mrcch IX 16, Śak IV)

58 सोऽयमप्यहमेव ह्यमुना कृपण धनमित्राख्यया चान्तरित (DKC p 63)

59 हा, हृदयसार मे फल्गुना विपरिवर्तयसि (ASK p 62 also cp DKC p 80 असारमतिगरीयसा क्रीणासि)

APPENDIX XI

SUBHĀSITAS (GOOD SAYINGS)

1 अतिमानुषप्राणसत्त्वप्रज्ञाप्रकर्षस्य न किंचिद्दुष्करं नाम (DKC p 109, also cp ASK p 75 नास्त्यमीषां दुष्करं नाम)

2 अर्थमूला हि दण्डविनियुक्तकर्मारम्भा, न चान्यदस्ति पापिष्ठं तत्र दौर्बल्यात् (DKC p 210)

3 अर्थो न संभृत कश्चिन्न विद्या काचिदर्जिता । न तप संचितं किंचिद् गतं च सकलं वय ॥ (KA II 161)

4 अर्थो हि महात्मनामनुच्छिन्नसन्ततियन प्रवाह (ASK p 58)

5 अवनामान्य दारिद्र्यम् (DKC p 82)

6 अविमृश्यकारिणं हि नियतमनेका पतन्त्यनुशयपरम्परा (*ib* p 161)

7 अपि हास्यता हि जन्मभूमिरनभ्यासा (*ib* p 193)

8 आत्मानमात्मना नवगाहयन्ति सन्त (*ib* p 92, cp *Gita* VI 5)

9 इह जगति हि न निरीहं देहिनं श्रिय संश्रयन्ते श्रेयांसि च सकलान्यनलसानां हस्ते नित्यसान्निध्यानि (DKC p 181)

10 का हि नाम भगवती भवितव्यतामतिक्रम्य यथासमीहितं साधयति यथा ? (ASK p 10)

11 चिरमदृष्टान्यस्माद् रागान्धा हि स्वजना भवति भाजनं विस्रम्भस्य (ASK p 193)

12 जीवितं सति भद्रम् (*ib* p 39 cp जीवन् नरो भद्रशतानि पश्यत् ।)

13 दत्तमदीनेन मनसा धनम् (ASK p 177)
14 दुरवगमा हि दैवगतिः (ib p 198)
15 ननु दाक्षिण्यमन्यत् सर्वस्य भवति प्रियम् (KA II 174)
16 न चास्य मनागपि महता परदुःखापनयेन (KA II 173)
17 न विचारयोग्या गुरूणां पिण्डदानामादेशा (ASK p 241)
18 न हि विवेकः क्षुभितस्य (ib p 27)
19 नात्यन्तानिष्टतममात्मत्यागात् (DKC p 82)
20 नियतिः केन लङ्घ्यते (KA II 172)
21 निष्कारणमेव वा जन्मान्तरनिरत्ययप्रवृत्तकर्मवासनाबलेन वा दान-मात्रेणैव क्वचित् कश्चिदारोपयति पात्रं प्रेमाणम् अनन्तरं चाप्रतिसंहार-दारुणं द्रोहमितरत्र । सैषा लोकस्थितिः (ASK p 55)
22. वज्रपाणीव भवितव्यस्य विस्फूर्जितानि (ASK p 164)
23 भगवती खलु तपश्चर्या भाविनमत्ययमपि परिवर्तयितुम् (ib p 150)
24 मरणमुत्सवो दारिद्र्यज्वरग्रस्तानाम् (ib p 177)
25 सुभरो हि भारः गिरेरविरलस्य उच्चैः शिरसाम् न तु लघीयान् परस्य पादरेणुः (ib p 56)
26 सैषा मज्जनाचरिता सर्वप्रियदर्शनीयापि कारणेऽन्तःपुरोपयानादर सह्यस्व (DKC p 174)
27 स्वदेशो देशान्तरमिति नेयं गणना विदग्धस्य पुरुषस्य शैशिरमिव किंचित् प्रणामस्त्वयोरनयोर्निर्देशेन दारत्यागेन समाश्वस (DKC p 80)
28 स्वभावशुद्धः स्फटिको न संस्कारमपेक्षते (KA III 178)

APPENDIX XII

POINTS OF AFFINITY BETWEEN DANDIN AND HIS GREAT PREDECESSORS KĀLIDĀSA AND BĀṆA

KĀLIDĀSA

1 Cp DKC p 141 निरन्तरकण्टकावृतलब्ध– with Kum V 34 विराजिनान्तरवाटकर ते दन्तवाससा ।
2. Cp DKC p 163 तामन्वशो (भगवती) नियमनोऽभिषेकाचरत् । परिजनं च दाक्षिण्यनिषिद्धाम्नायीनमकरोत् । with Śāk IV 18 कुरु प्रियसखीवृत्तिं सपत्नीजने । भूयिष्ठं भव दक्षिणा परिजने ।

3 Cp DKC p 196 अत्र हि व्यायामोत्कर्षादापत्सूपकर्ता जङ्घाजव, मेदोऽपकर्षादङ्गाना स्थैर्यकार्कश्यातिलाघवादीनि, सत्त्वानामवस्थान्तरेषु चित्तचेष्टितज्ञानम्, उत्साहशक्तिसंधुक्षणेन प्रत्यनीकविश्वासनम् इति बहुतमा गुणा । with Śak II 5 मेदश्छेदकृशोदर लघु भवत्युत्थानयोग्य वपु सत्त्वानामपि लक्ष्यते विकृतिमच्चित्त भयक्रोधयो । उत्कर्ष स च धन्विना यदिषव सिद्ध्यन्ति लक्ष्ये चले मिथ्यैव व्यसन वदन्ति मृगयामीदृग्विनोद कुत ॥, also cp Ragh IX 49

4 Cp DKC p 63 अखिल च विहतध्वस्त स्त्रीबालहार्यशस्त्रम् with Ragh VII 67 इत परानर्भकबालहार्यान् पश्य ।

5 Cp DKC p 68 सा चेदियमहार्यनिश्चया with Kum V 8 विमुच्य सा हारमहार्यनिश्चया ।

6 Cp DKC pp 73-4 न चेद्रहस्यमिच्छामि श्रोतु शोकहेतुम् । with Kum V 40 न चेद्रहस्य प्रतिवक्तुमर्हसि ।

7 Cp DKC p 74 युवतिललामभूता काममञ्जरी with Śāk II 7 f आश्रमललामभूता शकुन्तलाम् ।

8 Cp DKC p 84 सविभ्रमारचितभ्रूलतमभिवीक्ष्य with Kum III 5 आरेचितभ्रूचतुरै कटाक्षै ।

9 Cp DKC p 146 समापत्तिदृष्टा (कन्यका), and p 158 समापत्तिदृष्ट- with Vikr I समापत्तिदृष्टेन केशिना ।

10 Cp DKC p 180 तन्न सह्यानि त्रीण्यहानि with Ragh V 25 द्वित्राण्यहान्यर्हसि देव सोढुम् ।

11 Cp ASK p 143 पवनप्रहतमार्गविमार्गणमार्गनिगमप्रचलजालमालानुकारिणीभिस्तद्विसर्पिणीभिर्दीर्घिनिभि with Kum V 85 मार्गाचलव्यतिकराकुलितेव सिन्धु शैलाधिराजतनया न ययौ न तस्थौ ।

12 Cp ASK p 43 प्रत्यवायगदोषापा शापनिर्व्यूढया यथाभूत शब्दगन्ध । with Ragh II 53 क्षतात् किल त्रायत इत्युदग्र क्षत्रस्य शब्दो भुवनेषु रूढ ।

13 Cp ASK p 50 पुत्रस्य पोषणे रक्षणे विनयाधाने च यतितव्यम् । with Ragh I 24 प्रजाना विनयाधानाद्रक्षणाद् भरणादपि । स पिता पितरस्तासा केवल जन्महेतव ॥

14 Cp ASK p 164 वंशस्थानीव भवितव्यस्य द्वारसृजितानि । with Śāk I 16 भवत्रा भवितव्याना द्वाराणि भवन्ति सर्वत्र ।

15 Cp KA I 45, II. 129, 203 and 286 with Śāk. I. 20, 25, 18 and Ragh. VIII 57 respectively (see App VI)

BĀṆA

1 Cp ASK pp 63-4 [illegible] with Kād. para 12 [illegible] किरीटकोटिभि ।
2. Cp ASK p 59 ([illegible]) [illegible] with Kād para 11 ([illegible]) [illegible] । Also cp para 270 Hear p 194.
3 Cp ASK p 65 [illegible] । with Hear. p 203 [illegible] इव [illegible] ।
4 Cp ASK p 38 [illegible] with Hear p 101 [illegible] ।
5 Cp ASK p 38 [illegible] with Hear p 243 [illegible] etc., also cp. ib p 165
6 Cp ASK p 73 [illegible] etc with Hear p 181 [illegible] दुर्विनीत ।
7 Cp ASK p 4 [illegible] । with Kād para 44 [illegible] ।
8 Cp ASK p 222 [illegible] with Kād para 15 [illegible] ।
9 Cp DKC p 75 [illegible] with Kād para 151 [illegible] ।

10 Cp DKC p 190 गीतनृत्यवाद्यादिष्वबाह्य with Hcar p 39 नृत्यगीतवादित्रेष्वबाह्य ।

11 Cp DKC p 141 मधुरकूणितत्रिभागेन चक्षुषा with Hcar p 148 तिर्यक्कूणितनेत्रत्रिभागेन कामदेवेन , also cp Kād paras 78, 170, 198 342

12 Cp DKC p 111 ममाचार्यकमिव कर्तुमुत्थिते क्षपाकरे, with Hcar p 24 आचारस्याचार्यकमिव कुर्वाणम् ।

13 Cp ASK pp 44 8 (derision of Lakṣmī) with Kād paras 104-6, ASK pp 52-4 (description of omens and portents) with Hcar pp 162, 163, 186 ASK pp 160-1 (description of lying in chamber) with Kād paras 64, 65 and ASK pp 207 17 (exhortation of Vamadeva) with Kād paras 103-10 (exhortation of Śukanāsa)

14 Cp KA II 197 and 302 with Kād paras 103 and 85 respectively (see App VI)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(i) WORKS OF DANDIN

1 *Avantisundarikathā* (1) ed M R Kavi Madras 1924, (2) ed. K. S Mahadeva Sastri Trivandrum 1954 (refs in the work are from this ed), (3) anonymous summary in verse styled as *Avantisundarikathāsāra* ed Dakṣina Bhāratī Series, 1924, ed G Harihara Sastri, Madras, 1957

2. *Daśakumāracarita* (1) ed M R. Kale containing current PP and UP with English trans Bombay, 1925 (reprinted Delhi, 1966) (refs in the work are from this ed) (2) ed G Buhler and P Peterson Bombay, 1891 second ed by G J Agashe containing current PP and PVD, Bombay, 1919 (3) NSP ed containing current PP and UP with Pada of Kavindrācārya Sarasvatī, Bhūṣ of Śivarāma and Laghu of Bhānucandra, Bombay 1951, (4) ed H H Wilson, London 1846 (5) English trans (*The Ten Princes*) A W Ryder, Chicago 1927, (6) German trans J Hertel, Leipzig, 1922 (7) German trans J J Meyer, Leipzig 1902, (8) Hindi trans Motichandra Delhi

3 *Kāvyādarśa* (1) ed V N Iyer, with Jivananda Vidyasagara s comm Madras 1952 (refs in the work are from this ed) (2) ed M Rangachariar with Hṛd and Taruna, Madras 1910, (3) ed V Krishnamachariar, with Śrut and Taruna Tiruvadi, 1936 (4) ed K Rai with Premacandra Tarkavā gisa s comm., Calcutta 1881, (5) ed S K Belvelkar Poona 1924, (6) ed Rangacharya Reddy, BORI Poona 1938, (7) ed Ananta Lal and Upendra Jha work styled as *Kavyalaksana* with Ratna comm , Darbhanga 1957 (8) ed Ram Chandra Misra with Hindi trans , Varanasi, 1958 (9) D T Tatacharya with Hrd Śrut and Taruna, Bombay, 1941

(ii) WORKS OF VEDIC AND CLASSICAL SANSKRIT LITERATURE

1 *Abhijñānaśakuntala* of Kālidasa, ed Jivananda Vidyasagara Calcutta, 1914 ed M R Kale Bombay 1961

2 *Abhijñānaśakuntalacarcā* anonymous ed Dr K Raghavan Pillai, Trivandrum, 1961
3 *Agni Purāna* ed Mansukh Rai Mor, Calcutta, 1957
4 *Aitareya Brāhmana* ed Satyavrata Samasrami, Calcutta, 1894-1906
5 *Āpastamba Dharmasut a* ed Buhler, Bombay, 1892 4
6 *Arthasastra* of Kauṭilya (1) ed R P Kangle, Bombay, 1960 (refs in the work are from this ed) English trans, 1963 (2) ed T Ganapati Sastri, Trivandrum, 1924 5, (3) ed Vachaspati Gairola Varanasi 1962
7 *Aṣṭadhyayi* of Panini ed Sankara Rama Sastri, Madras 1937
8 *Atharvaveda* ed S D Satvalekar Pardi (Balsad)
9 *Bhagavadgita*, ed Gita Press, Gorakhpur
10 *Bhagavata Purana* ed Gita Press Gorakhpur 1965
11 *Bhasanaṭakacakra* (Bhasa s plays) ed C R Devadhar Poona, 1937
12 *Bhojaprabandha* of Ballala, Bombay 1913
13 *Bṛhatkathamañjari* of Ksemendra KM ed 1931
14 *Bṛhatkathaslokasamgraha* of Budhasvāmin ed F Lacote, 1908 ff
15 *Bṛhatsamhita* of Varahamihira ed Varanasi 1897, ed (in two vols) Bangalore 1947
16 *Buddhacarita* of Aśvaghosa ed E B Cowell Oxford 1893 English trans E H Johnstone Lahore 1936
17 *Carakasamhita*, ed J Vidyasagara Calcutta 1896
18 *Caturbhani* or *Śṛngarahaṭa* (a collection of four *bhanas*, namely *Padmaprabhṛtaka* of Śūdraka *Dhurtaviṭasamvada* of Īśvaradatta, *Ubhayabhisarika* of Vararuci and *Padatāḍitaka* of Śyamilaka) ed Motichandra and V S Agrawal, Bombay 1959
19 *Gauḍavaho* of Vakpatiraja ed S P Pandit, Bombay, 1887
20 *Harṣacarita* of Baṇa NSP ed with Śaṁkara s comm 1946
21 *Jātakamala* of Āryaśura ed Hendric Kern Harvard Oriental Series 1891
22 *Kādambarī* of Bāṇa (1) ed P L Vaidya Poona 1935 (refs

in the work are from this ed) (2) NSP ed with Bhanucandra-Siddhacandra comm 1932 (3) ed P Peterson Bombay 1883

23 *Kāmandakīyanītisāra* Bombay, 1952

24 *Kāmasutra* of Vātsyāyana ed with *Jayamangala* comm Varanasi 1964

25 *Kāsikā* of Vamana and Jayaditya ChSS ed 1931

26 *Kathāsaritsāgara* of Somadeva NSP ed 1930

27 *Kaumudīmahotsava* of (?) kā ed Ramakrishna Kavi Trichur 1929

28 *Kavindravacarasamuccaya* ed F W Thomas Calcutta 1912

29 *Kirātārjunīya* of Bhāravi ChSS ed 1961

30 *Kumārasambhava* of Kālidāsa, ChSS ed 1963

31 *Madhurāvijaya* of Gangādevī ed G Harihara Sastri Trivandrum, 1916

32 *Mahābhārata* ed Gita Press Gorakhpur 1956

33 *Mahabhāsya* of Patañjali ed Bhagwan Dev Jhajjar (Rohtak) 1962

34 *Malatımādhava* of Bhavabhūti NSP ed 1926

35 *Mālavikāgnimitra* of Kālidāsa ed Charudeva Shastri Lahore 1933

36 *Mallikāmāruta* of Uddandanātha ed Jivananda Vidyasagara Calcutta 1878

37 *Manusmrti* ed with Kullūka's comm Bombay 1888

38 *Mattavilāsa* of Mahendravikramavarman, TSS ed 1917

39 *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa ed Dr S K De New Delhi 1957

40 *Mrcchakatika* of Śūdraka ed V G Paranjpe Poona 1937 ed M R. Kale Bombay 1962.

41 *Mudrārāksasa* of Visākhadatta ed C R Devadhar and V M Bedekar Bombay 1948

42 *Naisadhacarita* of Śrīharsa ed K K. Handiqui Poona 1956.

43 *Nāmasamgrahamālā* Madras Govt. Oriental Mss Lib

44 *Nirukta* of Yāska ed. with *Nighantu* V K Rajwade, Poona 1940

45 *Nyāyabindu* of Dharmakirti Calcutta 1899

46 *Pañcatantra* of Visnuśarman ed Nrsimhadeva Sastri, Lahore, 1932
47 *Pāraskara Gṛhyasutra* ed Stenzler Leipzig, 1876
48 *Raghuvaṃśa* of Kālidāsa, NSP ed , 1916
49 *Ramāyana* of Valmiki, ed Gita Press Gorakhpur
50 *Ravanavadha* of Bhaṭṭi ed with *Jayamangalā* comm , NSP ed , 1887
51 *Ṛgveda* ed F Max Muller
52 *Rtusamhara* of Kālidāsa NSP ed , 1922
53 *Śarngadharapaddhati* of Śarngadhara ed P Peterson, Bombay 1927
54 *Śatapatha Brahmana* ed J Eggeling, Delhi 1963
55 *Saundarananda* of Aśvaghosa ed Hara Prasad Sastri, Calcutta, 1910
56 *Setubandha* of Pravarasena, NSP ed , 1895
57 *Śiśupalavadha* of Māgha with Mallinātha s comm , NSP ed 1927
58 *Subhasitavali* of Vallabhadeva ed P Peterson, Bombay, 1886 revised ed (R D Karmarkar) Poona 1961
59 *Suktimuktavali* (or *Subhāṣitamuktavali*) of Jahlaṇa, ed F Krishnamacharya GOS ed Baroda, 1938
60 *Suktiratnahara* of Kaliṅga Rāya Surya, Trivandrum, 1939
61 *Suśrutasamhita* ed J Vidyasagara Calcutta, 1889
62 *Svapnavasavadatta* of Bhasa, ed T Ganapati Sastri Trivandrum 1912 1916
63 *Taittiriya Āranyaka* ed H N Apte, Poona, 1898
64 *Tarkasamgraha* of Annambhaṭṭa ed Nṛsimhadeva Sastri, Lahore 1938
65 *Tattvasamgraha* of Śāntarakṣita GOS ed , Baroda, 1926
66 *Tilakamañjari* of Dhanapāla NSP ed , 1903
67 *Upaniṣads* (principal Upaniṣads), ed Gita Press
68 *Uttararamacarita* of Bhavabhuti ed M R. Kale, Bombay, 1934
69 *Vākyapadīya* of Bhartṛhari Varanasi 1905
70 *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu (1) ed with English trans , L. H Gray 1962 (2) ChSS ed 1954
71 *Vikramorvaśiya* of Kālidāsa NSP ed 1914
72. *Viṣnupurāna*, ed Venkateshvara Press, Bombay 1910.

73 *Uttararatnākara* of Kedārabhaṭṭa, ed. Lahore 1942.
74 *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* with *Mitākṣarā* comm., NSP ed 1936

(iii) WORKS ON HISTORY OF SANSKRIT LITERATURE

1 Chaitanya, K. *A New History of Sanskrit Literature* Delhi 1963
2. De Dr S K *Aspects of Sanskrit Literature* Calcutta 1959
3 — *History of Sanskrit Literature*, Calcutta, 1947
4 Keith Dr A. B *A History of Sanskrit Literature* London, 1920
5 — *Classical Sanskrit Literature*, Calcutta 1959
6 — *Sanskrit Drama* London 1924
7 Kochhar, Dr Harivansh *Apabhramsa Sahitya* Delhi, 1956
8 Krishnamachariar M *History of Classical Sanskrit Literature* Madras, 1937
9 Lacote F *Essai sur Guṇāḍhya et la Bṛhatkathā* 1908
10 Mirashi Dr V V *Kālidāsa* Bombay 1956
11 Pawate I S *Structure of Aṣṭādhyāyī*
12. Pischel R. *Die orientalischen Literaturen*
13 Tripathi Dr C N *Campu Kāvya ka Ālocanātmaka evam Aitihāsika Adhyayana* Varanasi 1965
14 Upadhyaya, B D *Sanskrit Sāhitya kā Itihāsa* Varanasi 1958
15 Varadachari V *History of Samskṛta Literature* Allahabad 1952
16 Winternitz, M *A History of Indian Literature*, vol III pt. I, English trans by Subhadra Jha Delhi 1963

(iv) WORKS ON POETICS

A. ANCIENT

1 *Abhinavabhārati* a comm. on BNS by Abhinavagupta, ed. Acharya Vishveshvara, Delhi, 1960
2. *Agni Purāṇa* ed Mansukh Rai Mor Calcutta, 1957
3 *Alamkārasarvasva* of Ruyyaka ed. S S Janaki Delhi 1965 ed Dr R. C Dwivedi Delhi 1965
4 *Aucityavicāracarcā* of Kṣemendra, ed S N Singh Varanasi, 1950

5 *Candrāloka* of Jayadeva NSP ed 1955
6 *Dasarupaka* of Dhanamjaya (1) ed Dr Bhola Shankar Vyasa Varanasi 1962 (2) ed C. O Haas, Delhi, 1962
7 *Dhvanyāloka* of Ānandavardhana with *Locana* comm of Abhinavagupta ed Jagannath Pathak Varanasi, 1965
8 *Ekavalī* of Vidyādhara ed K P Trivedi Bombay 1903
9 *Kavirajamārga* of Nrpatuṅga ed K B Pathak, 1898
10 *Kavyalamkara* of Bhamaha (1) ed B N Sharma and B D Upadhyaya Varanasi, 1928 (2) ed Devendra Nath Sharma Patna, 1962
11 *Kavyālamkāra* of Rudrata, ed with Namisadhu s comm, Dr Satyadeva Chowdhury Delhi 1965
12 *Kavyalamkarasārasamgraha* of Udbhata with *Laghuvrtti* comm of Pratīhārenduraja ed R D Banhatti BORI Poona 1925
13 *Kavyalamkarasutra(vrtti)* of Vāmana ed Acharya Vishveshvara (intro by Dr Nagendra) Delhi 1954
14 *Kavyamimamsa* of Rajasekhara ed Dr Ganga Sagar Rai, Varanasi 1964
15 *Kavyanusasana* of Hemacandra NSP ed 1934
16 *Kavyanusasana* of Vagbhata II with *vrtti* NSP ed, 1915
17 *Kavyaprakāśa* of Mammata ed Acharya Vishveshvara Varanasi 1967
18 *Kuvalayananda* of Appaya Dīkṣita ed Dr Bhola Shankar Vyasa, Varanasi 1956
19 *Natyasastra* of Bharata (1) ChSS ed, 1929 (refs in the work are from this ed unless otherwise specified) (2) GOS ed 1926 ff (3) KM ed 1943
20 *Pratāparudrayasobhusana* of Vidyānatha ed K P Trivedi Ahmedabad 1909
21 *Rasagangādhara* of Jagannātha NSP ed, 1916
22 *Sāhityadarpana* of Viśvanātha (1) ChSS ed 1947 (2) ed Dr P V Kane Bombay 1951
23 *Sarasvatikanthābharana* of Bhoja (1) ed A Borooah Calcutta 1884 (2) NSP ed 1934
24 *Siyabaslakara* of Sīlavarnamegha ed Gian Singh, Colombo, 1964
25 *Śrngāraprakāśa* of Bhoja (1) ed G R. Josyer, Mysore,

vols I-II 1955, 1963, (2) MS in 4 vols in Govt. Oriental Mss Lib, Madras No 3252

26 *Vāgbhaṭālamkāra* of Vāgbhata I Varanasi 1957

27 *Vakroktijīvita* of Kuntaka ed Dr S K De Calcutta, 1961

28 *Vidagdhamukhamandana* of Dharmadāsa Suri NSP ed 1914

29 *Visnudharmottarapurāna*, ed Venkateshvara Press 1912

30 *Vyaktiviveka* of Mahimabhatta ChSS ed 1936

B MODERN

1 Chaitanya Krishna *Sanskrit Poetics* Bombay 1965

2 Chowdhury Dr N N *Kāvyatattvasamīksa* (*Philosophy of Poetry*) Delhi 1959

3 De Dr S K *History of Sanskrit Poetics* (in two vols) Calcutta 1960

4 — *Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics* Calcutta 1959

5 — *Sanskrit Poetics as a Study of Aesthetics* Bombay 1963

6 Gyani Dr S D *Agni Purāna A Study* Varanasi 1964

7 Harichand Dr *Kalidāsa et l' art poetique de l' Inde*

8 Hazra R C *Studies in the Upapurānas* Calcutta 1960-3

9 Hudson W H *An Introduction to the Study of Literature* London 1949

10 Kane Dr P V *History of Sanskrit Poetics* Delhi 1961

11 Lahiri Dr P C *Concept of Riti and Gunas in Sanskrit Poetics* Dacca 1937

12 Nagendra Dr *Bhāratiya Kāvyaśāstra kī Bhūmikā* Delhi 1955

13 Nobel J *Foundations of Indian Poetry*

14 Pandey Dr K C *Comparative Aesthetics* vol I Varanasi 1959

15 Poddar K L *Sanskrit Sāhitya kā Itihāsa* (in two parts) Varanasi 1962

16 Raghavan, Dr V *Number of Rasas* Adyar (Madras) 1940

17 — *Some Concepts of the Alamkāraśāstra* Adyar (Madras) 1942

18 — *Śṛngāraprakāśa* (a critical study) Madras 1963

19 Sankaran A *Some Aspects of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit* Madras 1929
20 Tripathi Dr J S *Ācārya Dandi evam Sanskrit Kāvyasastra ka Itihasa darsana* Allahabad 1968
21 Vyasa Dr B S *Bhāratiya Sahityaśastra aur Kavyalamkara* Varanasi 1965

(v) WORKS ON ANCIENT INDIAN HISTORY AND CULTURE
1 Agnihotri Dr P D *Patañjali kalina Bharata* Patna 1963
2 Agrawal Dr V S *Harsacarita eka Samskrtika Adhyayana* Patna 1953
3 — *Kadambari eka Samskrtika Adhyayana* Varanasi, 1958
4 — *Panini kalina Bharatavarsa* Varanasi 1955
5 Buhler G *Die Indischen Inschriften und das Alter der Indischen Kuntspoesie* (in *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1890) trans by Ghate in *IA* XIII
6 Collins M *Geographical Data of the Raghuvamsa and Daśakumaracarita* Leipzig 1907
7 De Dr S K *Ancient Indian Erotics and Erotic Literature* Calcutta 1959
8 Fleet J F *Dynasties of Kanarese Kings* (in *Bombay Gazetteer* vol I pt II 1896)
9 Ganguly D C *The Eastern Calukyas* Varanasi 1937
10 Gawronski *Sprachl Untersuchungen uber das Mrcchakatika und das Daśakumaracarita* 1907
11 Gode Dr P K *Studies in Indian Cultural History* vols I II 1960 61
12 Gupta Dr D K *Society and Culture in the Time of Dandin*
13 Majumdar Dr R C *Ancient India* Varanasi 1952
14 Majumdar Dr R C Pusalkar Dr A D and Majumdar Dr A K (ed) *The History and Culture of the Indian People* vol III *The Classical Age* Bombay 1962 vol IV *The Age of Imperial Kanauj* 1964

15 Mendis G C and Geiger *Early History of Ceylon* Calcutta 1947
16 Mirashi Dr V V *Vākāṭaka Rājavamsa kā Itihāsa aur Abhilekha*, Varanasi 1964
17 Mishra Dr S S *Mānasollasa eka Sāmskṛtika Adhyayana* Varanasi 1966
18 Mookerji Dr R K *Ancient India*
19 Pandeya Dr R. B *Historical and Literary Inscriptions* Varanasi 1962
20 Raychoudhury Dr H C *Political History of Ancient India* Calcutta 1950
21 Sastri K A Nilakanta *A History of South India* Oxford 1951 (new ed 1966)
22 Sircar Dr D C *Select Inscriptions* vol I Calcutta 1965
23 Smith V A *Early History of India* Oxford 1958
24 Tripathi Dr R S *History of Ancient India* 1960
25 Yazdani Dr G (ed) *The Early History of the Deccan* 2 vols, London 1960

(vi) REFERENCE BOOKS
1 *Amarakosa* ed NSP, 1940
2 *Apte s Practical Sanskrit English Dictionary* ed Dr P K Gode and Karve (in 3 vols) Poona 1958
3 *Hindi Sahitya Kosa* ed Dr Dhirendra Varma Varanasi 1958
4 *Śabdakalpadruma* of Rādhākāntadeva (in 5 vols) Delhi 1961
5 *Sanskrit English Dictionary* of Monier Monier-Williams Oxford, 1899 (reprinted in 1956)
6 *Webster s Third New International Dictionary of English Language* ed 1961

(vii) JOURNALS CATALOGUES ETC
1 *Annals of Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* Poona
2 *Annals of Oriental Research* Madras
3 *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume,* 1940
4 *Bombay Gazetteer*

5 *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* London
6 *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*
7 *Deccan College Descriptive Catalogue* Poona
8 *Epigraphia Indica*, Delhi
9 *Gottinger gelehrte Anzeigen*
10 *Indian Antiquary*, Bombay
11 *Indian Historical Quarterly* Calcutta
12 *Indian Studies in Honour of Lanman* Cambridge 1929
13 *India Office Catalogue*
14 *Indische Studien* (ed A Weber)
15 *Journal Asiatique* Paris
16 *Journal of Indian History* Trivandrum
17 *Journal of Oriental Research* Madras
18 *Journal of Royal Asiatic Society* London
19 *Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*
20 *Journal of the Travancore (Kerala) University Mss Library* Trivandrum
21 *Journal of the University af Bombay*
22 *Mysore and Coorg Catalogue* (B L Rice)
23 *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (V Raghavan Madras, 1949)
24 *Quarterly Journal of Mythic Society* Bangalore
25 *Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften*
26 *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*
27 *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften*
28 *South Indian Inscriptions* vol XII (ed V Venkatasubba Ayyar) Madras
29 *Wiener Zeitschrift fur die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
30 *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft*

INDEX

The page numbers following the asterisk (*) refer to the footnotes. The arrow (→) denotes a casual occurrence of the reference as distinct from the hyphen (-) which indicates a continued discussion

ERRATA

At page	*line*	*please read*	*for*
xi	15	have been	has been
7	24	निर्मत्सरो दिष्ट्या	निर्भत्सरो दिष्टया
11	36	App VI	App V
15	1	*Avantisundarikathā*	*Avatisundarīkathā*
15	33	pt III	pt II
30	2–3	if the earlier part of the *Dasakumāracarita* and the later portion of the *Avantisundarīkathā*	if the earlier part of the *Avantisundarikathā*
34	3	attempts	attemps
43	15	Gopinātha	Gopināthа Kaviraja
66	1	defines	difines
77	22	SSI II	SSI
83	9	contemporaneity	conteporaneity
139	33–4	therefor	therefore
180	19–20	Medhāvin	medhāvin
200	30	III 14 11	XIV 11
292	25	befooled	befoolled
389	27	माहात्म्यमश्नुवते	माहात्म्यमश्नुवत
395	8	अनूर्ध्वपरया	अनूर्ध्वनया